THE NEW CIVILISATION

THE NEW CIVILISATION

FOUR LECTURES DELIVERED AT
THE QUEEN'S HALL, LONDON,
IN JUNE 1927

BY

ANNIE BESANT D.L.



THE THEOSOPHICAL PUBLISHING HOUSE LIMITED
38 GREAT ORMOND STREET, LONDON, W.C.1

Published in 1927

Printed in Great Britain by
UNWIN BROTHERS, LIMITED, LONDON AND WOKING

CONTENTS

LECTURE		PAGE
I.	THE CRUMBLING OF CIVILISATION	7
II.	THE RELIGION OF THE NEW CIVILISATION	25
III.	EDUCATION IN THE NEW CIVILISATION	43
IV.	ECONOMICS OF THE NEW CIVILISATION	69

LECTURE I

THE CRUMBLING OF CIVILISATION

FRIENDS:—

Many of you may remember that for the last two years, speaking in this hall, I have dealt with subjects closely allied to each other, one year with the coming of the World Teacher as regarded historically chiefly, and last year as regarded from the standpoint of modern and ancient psychology. During this course of lectures, while they are connected very closely with the coming of the World Teacher, I am going to deal really with certain practical points of enormous importance; and even apart from any belief in the historical connection between the coming of such a Teacher, and the change of civilisation which followed it, even without that connection, the general signs of the times about you, the remarkable conditions of our earth, especially during the past year and the early part of the present year, ought to draw your attention, as reasonable and thoughtful people, to the general idea that there is much change in the air. When we find, for instance, the very unstable equilibrium, as some scientists have called it, of the crust of our earth, that seems to suggest changes that may be startling to those who have not studied the history

of the past. And after all the crust of our earth is rather an important standpoint for us, seeing that it is the ground on which we stand. So very many earthquakes have taken place, as you may have noticed if that point is of interest to you. I have noticed them because I was expecting them, and I kept a record of them as they turned up one after another. I know there are many more interesting things in the newspapers than earthquakes. The newspapers take much more interest in what horse is going to win the Derby and the sayings of any jockey who is going to ride in the race, than they do in those more serious matters which ought to interest people; intelligent educated people should take some reasonable thought for the future, and should feel to some extent, at least, the responsibility of their own share in shaping the thought of the time, of their own duty in trying to form some rational conception of the nature and probable results of the coming changes.

Now these changes are the matters to which I propose to draw your attention to-day, as to the fact of the changes and the signs of the crumbling of civilisations, only alluding to the past but dealing more fully with the present signs. The fact that the coming of the World Teacher has been connected with these in the past is, of course, interesting and significant, still more the fact of the changes of civilisation that have taken place in similar epochs in our world's history. I have sometimes thought, when I have been perhaps in a rather ill-tempered mood, that when we scoff at Nero fiddling while Rome was burning, future generations may perhaps scoff at us, having seen the changes that we can only look forward to, and wondering why people were so indifferent, so wrapt up in the trivialities of life, so blind to the menace of the future.

And so I am going to try if I can to provoke thought anyhow in those who come to listen to these lectures.

I do not ask you in any way to accept my own thought, but I do ask you to think for yourselves. I should say that I should like to provoke discussion, but that, I think, is not very easy to compass in these days; so I shall be content with the humble ambition of winning a few of you really seriously to apply yourselves to a consideration of the present condition in the civilised countries of the world, with some study of the past, which may guide you in the present, and some attempt to prepare for changes that are coming. For it is always well to remember that it is the thought of large numbers of people that makes changes inevitable. The outside change may seem to be made by an Act of some legislature, but it is not the legislators that make the changes; it is the public opinion of the people, their relative ignorance, or knowledge, underlying the thought currents that they create. Legislators follow public opinion; they very rarely, if ever, create it. And it is on you and people like you that the future of our world inevitably depends, the future that you will see in its early stages, of which your children and your grandchildren will reap a large part of the harvest of the seed sown to-day. So I allude rather in passing to the fact that this coming of the World Teacher, that I have talked about so much, is connected with that other point in racial evolution to which I have been drawing attention for many years, the appearance of a new human type on our globe. Now I do not propose to spend any time in arguing that, because it has gone beyond the stage of argument. When H.P.B. mentioned it in 1888, very few people took any notice of what she said. When in 1909, in San Francisco, I gave my first lecture on the subject, there again, quite naturally, very little attention was paid to it. Science at that time was silent, and even as late as two years ago in the Association that is supposed to be for the advancement of at least British Science, when a theo-

sophical anthropologist, greatly daring, ventured to draw the attention of that learned assembly to the fact that a new sub-race was appearing, the learned gentlemen simply said they had not heard of it. Well, they ought to have heard of it—that is all one can say about it—because in America thay have been discussing this question now for a number of years. During the last few years the voice of the American scientist has been quite decisive on the subject, and it is not only the question of science that is concerned. I mention science because so many people think science is infallible, and therefore one likes to base oneself upon "infallible" science; but the fact is so widely pressed on public attention that, in addition to the scientific certainty, the teachers of the schools in California, for the last two years, have been experimenting on the children under their charge; and they have come to the very general conclusion that these children of the new type, where intelligence is concerned, at the age of 4½ to 5 years are the equals of the ordinary children at 7 or 8, and so on. So much is this recognised, and so numerous are the new type that in the schools of California the children are now being divided into two classes. It is found impossible to teach them together. The one class is so quick of apprehension, and the other, the ordinary normal child, though clever enough in his own line, has not the peculiar faculty called intuition, which is showing itself in this new type of human race. It is not, therefore, worth while to argue the matter any longer. There is a book which I think by this time is published in America by the leading Anthropologist, Dr. Hrdlika, a gentleman who, either this year or last, came over to England to give the Huxley lecture, for he is a man of international reputation. He has written a book called *The American Race*, in which he says that this new type is perhaps a sub-race. That is

a point on which a large number of people, who go by the name of Theosophists, are very largely agreed—that it is a sub-race. That is because they have been looking at sub-races in their books and already have studied five which have appeared since the great Mother-Race in Central Asia began sending out its emigrations towards the West. I may say in passing that I will not trouble you with these details at all, I shall only mention the Empires that were founded because these are a part of the subject which I have to deal with.

I ask you, then, either to take the new sub-race for granted, if you do not care to study it, or to test what I have just said by reading Dr. Hrdlika's book, or by making careful investigations by application to the Smithsonian Institute, or other sources of information, such as I have myself been consulting for a good many years past. Leaving that, then, as an acknowledged fact, I come to my next point. The sub-races that have appeared in the past, in the great Mother-Race to which we all belong, were not regarded or known then, or observed as special types, until they had been in existence for some hundreds of years. Then they were so markedly different, these different types, that later on, at least after their emigrations, they became recognised as separate sub-races. Now each of these had its own Teacher, each of them had its own civilisation, and each of them had its own Empire, which is a point which I will ask you to bear in mind, because that has a very close connection with all of you who are living in these Islands, in the British Colonies, in the American United States, and in other countries like Germany where the Teutonic type is very largely predominant. Take it, then, for the moment that in connection with each of these sub-types there was a Teacher, a civilisation, and a World Empire. If I wanted just to recall to you what is meant by a

World Empire, I would ask you to consider after the great emigrations had gone on from Central Asia, the Empire of Egypt, the Empire of Persia, the Empire of Rome, and those three succeeded in time by the great Empires that arose in the sub-Continent of India. All of these, except those in India, were Empires in which one sub-race dominated completely. They all established a domination over the world of their time. If you notice that fact, then, making a note that it is a fact in history, you might also notice that all the civilisations which flowered into these Empires have passed away. You can only find them in their sepulchres, and sometimes you have to dig deep into the crust of the earth before you find the earliest of the capital cities that grew up in those Empires. So far as they are concerned, they belong to ancient history and the tombs. Their relics alone remain. When we come to the Teutonic sub-race, the fifth of the number—I have mentioned four of the Empires—we do not find that that sub-race so far has established a World Empire. We do find, however, that that part of it living in Britain has begun laying the foundations—not understanding what they were doing particularly—by an enormous energy in colonising countries which did not belong to them. If you look over the history of England during the seventeenth, eighteenth, and even the nineteenth centuries, you may be struck by the fact that Britain was establishing in far-off countries a very remarkable collection of colonies of the British race. One great collection of colonies, as you know, was in North America. And there in the eighteenth century, for the time, the unity of this part of the Teutonic Race was broken. You all know about the tea-making in Boston Harbour, and the subsequent development of the United States of America. Those then broke away and so far delayed the progress of Britain—not in any scheme that she had, for she had

none—but in the fact that she was gradually laying the foundations of a world-wide rule.

You have to think now in centuries, because, as you have been told so often, Time is an illusion. But, living in that world of illusion, we must recognise the passage of time, and for these great world movements you must think in longish periods of time. I choose centuries, though in the larger ones you have to think in millennia. Do not, then, be in a hurry to see definite signs in each place quickly following each other in sequence. But look over the world in those three centuries that I have mentioned, the three preceding our own, and notice this enormous colonisation carried on by people of the British stock, all of them practically, with the exception of those settled in North America, the part that afterwards became the great American Republic—forming the future Teutonic Empire in the days of its infancy and youth. Other nations colonised also, but to nothing like the same extent, nor with the same success. I am leaving India for the moment out of the calculation—not because I ever forget her and her relation to the British Empire in the past and in the present, but because I am laying stress on the sub-race concerned in this particular matter of the unconscious building up of a great Empire. Then came a period when a quarrel arose between two branches, two great divisions of the Teutonic race—the late war. In that one very vital question was decided. The German Empire, a mighty military power, would, had it succeeded, evidently have founded an Empire of military force. Now while this nation was on the other side, and while you warmly condemn that ambition, it may be well in relation to it sometimes to look at home, and see if the Teutonic sub-race here has not done a good deal in the same manner. I am not very much concerned with that for the moment, because I want to

point out one remarkable fact—one good thing that the German Empire did, despite its autocracy and its dream of subduing the world, and that was that in its great cities it had no slums. I have flown over several of the German big cities, and when you go in an aeroplane you can estimate the ways cities are built, and I was very much struck by that fact. And one time after I had noticed it from the air, I enquired about it on the earth, and I found that my observations there were quite definitely correct, as I expected to find them, because I knew something of the life of the German manual workers, and I knew their general comfort in living, their interest in arts, such as music, and the large provisions that were made for training them to some extent in that art, especially because, I suppose, of the musical genius of the German people, taking them generally.

Now that is a very important point and I am asking you to think over it carefully. I am essentially opposed to an Empire of force. I think it is a thing which largely dwarfs a nationality. Perhaps, therefore, I am the more careful to put on record this one splendid result of an autocracy, that those who made the prosperity of the country by their labour were not forgotten by their Government, but were carefully helped, guarded and provided, not only with the necessaries of life, as ordinarily understood, but largely with that Art, that Culture, that possibility of a more human life which prevents men from turning into machines, hardly knowing anything of the beauty, the happiness, the splendour, the possibilities of human life.

Now, leaving that branch, let me come to the United States, the Great Republic. There are no slums in the United States except those where dwell the immigrant population. There are no slums among native-born Americans. You know I have been spending some seven months in the United States, partly occupied in

travelling and speaking, partly in more settled work, and I did not find slums. I found very comfortable houses, well cared for, with gardens sloping down to the roads of the towns. They do not wall in their gardens there, or put up hedges, so that you must not look over them. They leave them open mostly to the streets, and they make them bright with flowers, so that all the passers-by have the pleasure of going through flower-lined streets. Another point that I remarked with very, very great pleasure in America, was the absence of the class sense that I noticed. Now I have been a very great deal, I am happy to say, among the manual workers of England especially—not so much of Scotland. I have been in their houses as their guest, sat at their tables as a friend; but I was always conscious in those, that while personally I had no sense of the class difference, my kindly host had a sense of it, and it showed in his outer manners to myself. Now I do not find that in America. For the first time in my life, talking with people engaged in manual occupations of every kind, I found that they treated me entirely as a social equal. I cannot tell you how pleasant that was, and the sense of friendliness that it gave to the whole of the country. Driving along in a taxi the man who drove you would tell you all about the place, just as he would have done if you had been driving in a private car with the owner of the car driving. There was no sense of anything unusual in it, because there was not. Naturally people educated in that way would not live in slums, and they do not. So that beside the Empire of force I put the great Republic, not nearly as free as it ought to be, but still one in which class plays very little part in the education and the demeanour of the people. Of course wealth makes an enormous difference. But even there the man who is now a multi-millionaire may have started working in somebody else's workshop. When I come

to deal with the economic part of the new civilisation, there are some interesting points I shall want to speak of in relation to economics in America.

Looking, then, at this question of the slums for a moment, let me ask you to consider this historical fact and what it means for a nation that has as many slums as there are in this country. Wherever the masses of the people have been condemned to a low condition of human life, whether it be by chattel slavery or by serfage, or by wage slavery, there you have a cancer at the very root and heart of your civilisation, and unless you get rid of that you will die of the disease. Because of that, very great is your responsibility. All of you who are here are educated people, and on the educated people of the country most of the changes depend. I know there are changes that come by revolution, but that means chaos, longer or shorter as the case may be. And chaos is a thing that no wise person can desire as an interlude between two civilisations. Hence the importance of studying the conditions and getting rid of those which will render chaos inevitable.

Leaving that fact, then, let us go on to the next step in our study. And we shall find that we have to deal here with certain questions on which every one of us ought to have a definite opinion. What that opinion ought to be I have no right to dictate to any one of you, but you certainly ought to have an opinion. It is your duty as a citizen of the land. And in the formation of that opinion, to whatever particular line of thought and of action it may lead you, try to form it, if you can, with as much impartiality as you can compass, getting rid of the natural prejudices and conventions that so very much limit our powers of thought and diminish the usefulness of our intelligence. In this war that I spoke of the point was decided against the Empire of force. Now what is the only reasonable alternative? Surely a Commonwealth of free

nations joined together by ties of mutual respect and affection and good will and desire to promote the good of the whole Commonwealth. That seems to me to be the only alternative that can really last. And I would ask you to consider at your leisure whether there is anything that can be stable between the two. You can have a certain stability by force for a time, I know, but it is against the great law of Brotherhood which breaks every civilisation which is built up and maintained in contravention of that law. For remember, the law of Brotherhood is a natural law. It is based on the Unity of Life. There is but one God, and one Life which is in the whole of the worlds that He has made. And that Unity of Life means a Brotherhood of the many separated lives that exist in that Unity. Those who would think separately, for separate and small interests, for individual interests against the good of the Nation, for national interests against the good of all the Nations, they are bound to fail, because the law is sure and cannot be broken. It breaks whatever is built up against it, just as, if the law of gravitation be disregarded, the building falls. So do civilisations fall which are built in contravention of that law of human life. And the Brotherhood is not only human. That life is everywhere in our world. Nothing exists outside it. The sub-human kingdoms are also kingdoms of living things, the animal more sentient than the vegetable, but the vegetable sentient to an extent—limited I grant, but discovered by delicacy of instruments by Sir Jagadish Chandra Bose, the great Indian scientist. Lately a thought has arisen that the things called "non-living," like rocks even, have their own limited sensitiveness, massive sensations, not individualised or keen. And so we come gradually to realise that we are living in the midst of this vast assemblage of brothers, sub-human as well as human, and, as some of us know, super-human as well as human.

And just as the knowledge that you have, or may have, of this coming sub-race, may enable you intelligently to co-operate with its development, as others in the past had not the knowledge to do, so as you realise more and more this Unity of Life, and know that it comes from the "One without a Second," you may begin also to realise the obligations that lie upon you, the duties that you cannot really escape, of living in accordance with the law that exists.

And so when you turn to the conditions of the New Civilisation, this tremendous fact of the Brotherhood of all that lives—and as I have said there is nothing in our world that does not live, in different degrees—you begin then to realise that many changes will have to be made, not only in the political or economic organisation, but also in your own individual duties as one of the more intelligent divisions of this great and universal Brotherhood. And it is because of the vital importance of that teaching that the Theosophical Society, which has just been holding its Convention here, has made Brotherhood the one thing in which all members must agree. We can quarrel as much as we like about everything else. All our religious opinions and social opinions and economic opinions may differ. We may think each other either orthodox or heretical as much as we please; but on that one cardinal fact, that we are a nucleus of Universal Brotherhood, we must agree; we cannot honestly remain in the Society if we cease to believe in that supreme fact. Now that, of course, must colour all our thinking. And because those who call themselves Theosophists have been studying for very many years—the last fifty years—these deeper questions which underlie all outside changes in civilisation, I think especial responsibility lies on you, my Theosophical brethren, to do your share of the work in forming public opinion on the coming changes in the life of the Nation. All

citizens have a great responsibility, but you a peculiar one, because you have more knowledge, and the more knowledge you have, the greater your responsibility and your duty. All, however, have a share in that, and should take their part therein.

Looking, then, at this great question of the World Empires that the four preceding races and sub-races have had, and that are now all buried, what about this world-wide spread of the great Teutonic, or fifth sub-race in all its branches? What about the Colonies already founded, now Dominions, which, if you look at them on the map, you will see are a suggestion of a great Unity prevailing among them. But there is a question that you have to solve quickly, and are, to some extent, solving, though not quite as logically as it should be done. There you have to face the great question, if you do not have an Empire of force, then you cannot keep "subject" Nations within your rule. It must be a Commonwealth of free Nations, or you must lose your rule over them. That is a very pressing question, because you have a huge number of people—six to one in your Empire—who do not share the colour of your skin. Now the colour of a skin may be a question of beauty. Some like one, and some like the other, but that is not a radical difference in the position of human beings in any assemblage. When you come to consider that fact, you have also to consider your relations to six out of every seven of the people who form your far-flung rule. And that was the great forgetfulness—or not quite forgetfulness, but almost deliberate wrong—that Mr. Hearst showed at the time of his proposal that was so warmly welcomed, of uniting the English-speaking peoples. Even that, although he would not know it, would include an enormous number of Indians, who speak the English tongue very much better than some of us do. I suppose he was not thinking of those; they do not

count. But they will count. He forgot all about them, and he said he would not touch India. Then his plan cannot succeed. I may say this has been pointed out exceedingly clearly by Mr. Krishnamurti in an article which has stirred the Continent, but has not had any very large publicity here, where the argument was not congenial, of course, to the owners of English newspapers; still it circulated very largely over France, Germany, Holland, and other countries. That trouble has to be faced. There cannot be a Commonwealth of free white Nations if Britain is to be one of those white Nations. For her rule extends, as I have just said, over six times as many coloured people as white. And even the Australians are beginning to turn yellow. I do not know where their place will be in an Empire of the whites, after a few more generations. Now, is not what we really want—if this great Teutonic sub-race is to build up, as the other preceding races have done, a world-wide body—is not what we want that there shall be a real body, without "rulers and subjects" of one coloured kind of people over another? I am a heretic, I know, when I say that the only right to rule comes from Wisdom, but you will find that out some day, and I am content to wait. I know it is a most "undemocratic" sentence, but still I cannot change my opinion for that. I think many of the blunders from which you have suffered are because you do not realise, not only that every child has a right to education, and that the education of every child should extend, not only through the earlier stages, but right on into young manhood and womanhood, as it extends in your so-called upper classes in society. I shall have to deal with that when I speak of education in the New Civilisation.

Suppose, then, we agree that we will work for a Commonwealth, or that we will work against it, because some opposition is always very valuable in pointing

out the weak points of any scheme which may be devised. Suppose a large enough majority—as you will count heads without weighing their contents—decides that it wants a Commonwealth and not an Empire—and I hope they will decide that—then you will have to consider how you are going to build up your Commonwealth. With that subject I propose to deal on the next three Sundays. Meanwhile, may I suggest with regard to this question of the building, that it is one which ought now, without delay, to be taken into consideration, to be thought over, and, as I said, if possible, discussed. For we do not want a scheme put forward only by a few people. We want the thoughts of all the different classes within this mighty realm, so that every interest may be considered, and above all that a really human life may be secured for every child that is born into that coming Commonwealth. For that is the right of the child. Good surroundings, full education, training in the duties of the citizenship into which he is born—those the child has a right to claim from his elders, and his elders have the duty of so shaping Society that he may receive that from the international union of these free Nations in the great Commonwealth-to-come.

And you and I, and millions of others like us, have to work for that, have to try to point out the inevitable foundations of a civilisation that will last. And the only things that we have to choose between are the careful building or the rapid decay. There is no intermediate place. That is why I would fain awaken every one of you to the realisation that whatever his opinions, whatever his political party, every one of you has a duty of forming an opinion, and also of making your opinion as intelligent and as full of careful thought as you are able to make it in these days where education, at least of an elementary character, is so widespread. It is easier to

spread thought and to make public opinion than it was in past days. It is possible to arouse the public mind and the public conscience. The great difficulty that stands in the way is the selfish interest of some set against the human life of others.

Now the one thing that is valuable above all other things is human life, for it is the most highly developed life that we have to deal with in questions of nationalities, politics, and so on.

May I conclude by putting to you one thought that I hope will remain with you, however much you may disagree with some things that I have said, and that is that every child that is born into this coming Commonwealth has the right to circumstances that will develop in him to the full every good quality that he brings with him into the world. Now, naturally, those of us who know that reincarnation is a great fact in human life, know that evolution is a continual repetition of life in three worlds, the one where he gathers experience, the next where he sees the evil results of evil thinking and evil passions, and the last—by far the longest life of the three—where he weaves that experience into faculty, into capacity, which he brings with him when he comes again to birth, and enters on his next period of physical human life. The child who comes to us is not a blank slate on which we can write whatever we choose. He has himself written upon it by many a life in the past. He has traced the outlines of his own character, his own weaknesses, and his own strengths. He comes to us, a human being with a character; and that character should be the signpost of the education that we give, adapted to the child. For the child is not a piece of putty to be moulded into something by a system. He is a living human being of divine origin, and he has a right to everything that can evoke the Hidden God within him, and help him to overcome the more animal propensities which have

come from his earlier evolution. And so let us, in thinking out our Commonwealth, remember that the child represents our greatest national asset and demands from us the discharge of our highest duty. And the mother of the child must also have her place in our vigilant care. For on the Motherhood of the country depends the future. It is the mothers who give birth to the children, a natural fact too often forgotten, I think, in our civilised days. It is the mother within whose very substance the form and the framework of the child is built. And yet how we trample on our mothers too often, even on those who are bearing children, and make their lives so hard that the children are born less strong, less capable, less full of life, than every child should be when he comes into the world!

Oh! think of the mothers of your land more than you do. It is not without significance that the German constitution of free Germany has a special clause dedicated to the Motherhood of Germany, a consecrated trust put into the hands of the Nation, and too often neglected. The women have to fight for all they need, and are trampled into the dust too often in the streets of our towns. And so I would ask you, after thinking of the children, and providing well for them, to remember that no child can be healthy who is not born of one whose motherhood has been held sacred, because it gives a life to the Nation, and creates the future generations. If every man among you would see in every woman a potential mother; if as you honour your own mothers you would honour every woman who walks our streets; then one of the greatest curses of this civilisation, which has bred dreadful disease as well as unutterable degradation to womanhood, would be remedied for ever and you would make the country purer and healthier than it is. That must be part of our New Civilisation. That is an essential part if the civilisation is to live. And when the great principles

I have mentioned to-day are analysed, considered, accepted or rejected as you will—that is your responsibility—then we shall be in a frame of mind ready to consider the great departments of human life, the development of which, and the changes in which, will form our subject of study on the three next Sundays.

LECTURE II

THE RELIGION OF THE NEW CIVILISATION

FRIENDS :—

In my first lecture I pointed out two very opposite dangers which threatened respectively America and Europe. In Europe we had the excess, the terrible excess, of poverty; in America, what may sound strange to you, the excess of wealth. Both of these act as a practical cancer to civilisation, the one by reducing large numbers of the people to a constant struggle to exist—I do not say to live, but to exist; the other bringing a satiety which leads to a constant attempt to find new excitement, of living on the surface of things, of seeking satisfaction in ever greater and greater excitement, even the excitement of crime.

To-day I am to deal with the first of the three great departments of human life which affect every human being; and however much you may subdivide them they remain, I think, fundamentally three in number. The first of those, as I have put their order, is Religion. The work of religion, I shall submit to you, is to change our attitude and object in life, to seek unselfish, rather than selfish, ideals, and unselfishness ever widening out into larger and larger circles, until at last it shall embrace in one mighty

Brotherhood everything that lives. Then, after that, what we may call in a sense the most important of all—Education. That evolves and moulds our capacities, brings out the seeds of human power and faculty, and enables them to grow and to develop. That is necessary in order that by knowledge we may begin to understand; when to knowledge we add love, that turns it into wisdom. Education should be of a nature which shall help everyone who comes into the world to develop his faculties to the very best advantage. For out of education comes the culture of the individual and of the Nation; and that is the application of what we have learned in education to human life and the growth of humanity. Then in the third place I have put Economics—Religion in the New Civilisation, Education in the New Civilisation, Economics in the New Civilisation.

Now economics is the necessary basis that lies at the very root, the very foundation, of Society. It means the science of the right production and the right distribution of the various articles that form the material side in life. It means in addition to that, full opportunities for everyone to lead a really human life. For by human life I do not mean simply abundance of all that satisfies the physical body. I do not mean by human life all that gives physical pleasure, physical luxury, the possession of much, and far more than is necessary for the human life. But I do mean by human life, the development of those higher faculties in man which find happiness, not in the things that perish in the using, but that increase and grow with the using and the sharing; the treasures of the human mind as you find them in literature, the treasures of human emotion as you find them in art in all its many phases—I mean those greater and relatively permanent enjoyments which refine, which cultivate, which develop the higher side of our nature, and help to make man

what he ought to be if he is to reach perfection, the natural end of evolution.

And the first of those departments is the one with which I am to deal to-night—Religion in the New Civilisation. Naturally, then, we ought to begin with a clear understanding of what we mean by religion. Do we mean by it only the various religions of the world, each of them with its own particular value to those who follow it, but each of them necessarily partial and changing with the changes of the generations of men? I should define religion as that inner urge that we find in the human being to realise that life which is the life of God in man, the God within the man, cramped and cabined by his material surroundings, reaching out, as it were, to the God outside him, universally enveloping him as well as entering him, called often in Philosophy, God Immanent in the first case, Transcendent in the second case.

If it be true that there is but one Life, that that one Life is the all-enveloping power outside which nothing can exist, then it is fairly clear that that life abiding in the heart of a rational and emotional being, a being also of activities whereby he is effecting the material world around him, that that God within must necessarily be for ever striving to reunite Himself as it were with the God around. And so, wherever you find the human race, except for brief periods which soon slay themselves by their own excesses, we find this seeking after God, this urge, as I have called it, of the God within to satisfy Himself by reunion with the God around him, the God in his fellow-creatures, as well as the transcendent Life that includes all things.

That to me is what I mean by religion, this inner urge to know the greater Self. But the religions of the world might fairly be regarded as the answers of God without to this urge within the members of the human race—temporary answers, differing in much of

their detail, but ever with the same Love without, seeking the Love within.

So we find that with each great human type, a separate religion appears, and we can trace them down through the ages, one in their essence but each with its own symbology, each with its own dominant virtue, adding to that great garland of symbology and of virtues which we find when we realise the inner oneness and the outer differences of the religions of our world. For we can see in the great Mother Race that Unity is the one dominant idea, the "One, without a Second." Then we can find that that idea is repeated in Egypt by the sun, in Persia by fire, in Greece by harmony, music, sound. We can find in each as well that that note exists in man as well as in the world around him, and that each religion has its own specific dominant virtue, adding to the growing possibilities of the human race.

Seeing that Unity amid diversity, seeing these gradual additions to the religious wealth of the world, the next thing is to pierce that diversity and find the inner unity of all these different faiths. As we look at them from that standpoint, then it is that we begin to realise that all these religions are only differing answers from the one religion. We see in each of these the Unity which it shares with everyone of its fellow-faiths. And the first point in that Unity is the Immanence and Transcendence of God. Then we find, following upon that, the perfectibility of humanity as the goal of these divine lives in all the world. Then we see that if perfection is to be the goal, life after life must follow, ever growing in greatness, in radiance, and in strength. And so, in every great religion, we find that third common truth of Reincarnation. Then in order that these lives may be orderly and successful, we find that the life period is distributed through three worlds, the physical, the

intermediate, and the heavenly, and that in the physical, man gathers experience—experience of good and evil—but experience of every type and kind of life; that he gathers up that experience and carries it with him through the gateway of death. Then in the intermediate world we find that some of the experience has sorrow at its heart, because it is against the order of the universe and the beauty of the universe; that that bears its natural fruit of dissatisfaction and craving; dissatisfaction because in that subtler world the body has disintegrated and the cravings of the body can find no satisfaction there; and then a gradual withdrawal from such experience as "evil," and the storing of that withdrawal as part of the conscience of the future.

And then there is the passing on of those who have gathered experiences in the physical world and have separated them into good and evil in the intermediate world, to a long productive Heaven-world, where all the useful experience is woven into character, where the germs of faculties grow and are ready to bud into flower, where every noble aspiration becomes a capacity to achieve, every high thought becomes a faculty of the mind that shall be re-embodied in the physical world, every longing to help and to succour becomes that love which lasts, which death cannot touch or injure, becomes a deeper passion, a stronger emotion, a more compelling enthusiasm; so that after every leaving of that native land of ours, the Heaven-world, we come back from that long sojourn, back from that long weaving of experience into power, we come back again to the physical world with the germs of the faculties we have created out of experience within us, to be developed by a short life-period in the physical world. And so there is the turning over and over again of the wheel of births and deaths. That great doctrine, that great gospel of hope for every man, the certainty of perfection, no matter how he tries and

fails and struggles, that has been part of the heart of every great religion, obscured for a few centuries only in the life of Christendom for a very definite reason. The special work that had to be carried on in Christendom was to bring out creative activity, was to teach great lessons of activity as service, through that subrace especially to which this work was confided.

Now we find that the knowledge of Reincarnation lessens—and it is only fair to recognise that it lessens—to some extent the value of each separate human life. For people may sometimes think, "Well, if I do not do a thing in this life, I can do it in another. If I do not conquer and make this particular faculty now, I have a long future before me in which I can sow and cultivate it." It does to a certain extent limit the value of each separate human life. And since in the religion that was to rule in Christendom the concrete mind was to be highly developed, the activities to which it gave birth were to be fully utilised, each life was to be full of energy, of effort, in order that that individuality might be developed, as it only could be developed by struggle and by effort, for a short time only, this great truth of Reincarnation was veiled from ordinary sight, although it never quite perished out of Europe. For, even when denounced as a heresy by the dominant Church, some of the heretical sects preserved it and handed on the tradition to the future. Every now and then the truth comes out, as when in one of the great Musalman doctors of the Middle Ages you find this doctrine embodied. He wrote:

> I died out of the mineral and became a plant;
> I died out of the plant and became an animal;
> I died out of the animal and became a man.

Then he asks triumphantly:

> When did I ever grow less by dying?

Then it again woke in the poets and the philosophers of Europe, especially of Germany. It came across the sea to the poets of England, as to Wordsworth, where again you find its reappearance. And to-day from every side you can hear the statement of this idea of a continuing soul passing from life to life, growing, increasing, working for perfection; as was said by one professor, it is the only rational theory of immortality"; it is recognised as the one great gospel of hope, that however low we may be at the moment, we shall at last attain that perfection which the Christ commanded when He told His followers: "Be ye therefore perfect even as your Father in Heaven is perfect." You know every one of you well enough that in this one brief life you cannot gain perfection. You know that with our vagrant thoughts, our unruly emotions, our activities so often stained with selfishness and greed, that we cannot gain Divine perfection before we pass out of this life, although the Christ whom Christendom worships as God, commands that His followers should reach that point. Only through Reincarnation can you obey Him. Only through Reincarnation can you prove His command to be possible of fulfilment.

And these great basic truths are the truths that all religions have, and they all lead us up from the Unity of life to the Brotherhood of all that lives; that is the end which they seek to substitute for selfish striving, for individual gain at the loss of others, the Fatherhood of the one Life, the Brotherhood of all that lives; that is the attitude of all religions to the world. These basic truths are the foundation of their Unity.

And so we have—what has been called in America at the same time that the Theosophical Society was proclaiming that Unity in Asia—so we have the thought which is expressed by the words "The Fellowship of

Faiths"; the Fellowship is proved by their unity of origin, their sufficiency, at different stages of human progress, for those to whom they were given.

And that Fellowship of Faiths will be a central characteristic of the New Civilisation. That means that religious quarrels will find their ending, that religious wars will be looked upon as the worst of crimes, that instead of fear and distrust and even hatred between the members of these different faiths, all shall recognise the Fellowship, that they shall be as many jewels in a single diadem, many pearls in a great necklace round the neck of humanity.

And in the New Civilisation, this Fellowship will develop and grow—not suddenly, there are no such sudden leaps in nature, but there will be a steady growth in that direction, and you can see the beginning of that around you at the present day. Not very long before I left America I read in a Boston paper that the various Protestants of Boston City—for Boston is, of course, of the New England type of religion—that the various Protestants of this city met together in order to point out the excellencies of the Roman Catholic religion. Surely a remarkable gathering, that these two forms, which have been fighting for centuries, should by their representatives in a New England city, the inheritance of the Puritans, that these should meet together, not to criticise, not to quarrel, not to denounce, not to hate, but to explain the value of a Faith, the form of which they did not hold, and a Faith also which does not respond to such an action unhappily at present, as it claims that it is the unique form of Christianity. Such a meeting is surely a sign of progress towards the Fellowship. And when we find other meetings, wherein the Hebrew Rabbi and the Christian Minister joined together similarly in their recognition of the one God and of His Worship; when meeting after meeting is taking place in which so-called different

religions are joining hands; when we read that in one of the great religious cities in India—Madura in the south—Musalmans and Hindus met together in common public meeting and showed their Brotherhood by worshipping together and by exchanging tokens of love and trust, those two Faiths that often fight in Indian cities, those two Faiths that draw against each other, not only the weapons of the mind, but physical weapons by which they destroy each other's bodies, when they can meet in friendship in one of the most religious cities of India, surely the Fellowship of Faiths should not be so far off. And that is one of the things after which all who believe in religion ought to strive, not to obliterate all differences, but for the recognition of their value. For that is one of the lessons that the very earnest religionist sometimes finds it difficult to learn, that differences should not be used as reasons for discord, causes of disharmony, but rather as enrichment of concord, just as notes dissonant if played alone in combination may form part of the most splendid chords in music. Beethoven, the great master of chords, thus used apparent dissonances, reconciled them and made those magnificent chords which perhaps more than anything else rendered his name immortal amongst the masters of that great art. We learn along that line of thought that wherever we find difference of opinion we should welcome it rather than dislike it, utilise it to learn some new aspect of the many-sided truth, utilise it so as to see from our brother's angle of vision as well as from our own. How little would you know of the shape of any globe, if all of you stood on one side and saw that alone! But the man who is facing north learns something from the man who is facing south, and he of the east from him of the west. Every different angle shows the unity of the apparently diverse truths. And in the Fellowship of Faiths we learn the value of our brother's reli-

gion by those differences, as well as by the great truths in which it is in accord with our own.

Passing from that we may ask what will be the next great feature of religion in the New Civilisation. Knowledge, I think, rather than faith. Of that there are already signs. For that new race of which I have so often spoken is, as you know, developing a quality of Intuition, that which Bergson pointed out as more allied to instinct, inherited experience, than to the reasoning faculty in man. And if you would take the inherited experience as the experience inherited from one life after another, until that inherited experience shows itself as the life-product which we call instinct, which does not need experience before it causes action, which does not need reasoning before it acts; that is a life-preserving instinct in its lower forms; it is a truth-revealing intuition as it shows itself beyond the reasoning faculty and intellect in man.

Now it is that particular faculty which is showing itself in the children of the new sub-race. And as we look forward into the future and the New Civilisation which is to learn through centuries, remember, to build this up gradually, we begin to realise that the effect of this intuition in religion will be to transform religion from faith to knowledge. For intuition is a recognition of truth at sight, a recognition of truth that comes from the inner life and not from that life working through the external instruments of matter. The veil of subtle matter is only the garment of the soul, as intuition is developed; and that may be developed, as you probably all know, in advance of its appearance in the ordinary evolution of man.

I spoke to you, I think, last year on that great Science which is called the Science of Yoga, the union of the human Spirit with the Divine Life, self-consciously attained. That is won by using the laws of the mind as we know them, just as a gardener desiring to produce

finer flowers uses the laws of natural growth in the vegetable kingdom, eliminating those that are against his aim, and using untrammelled those that produce the result that he desires in the flower which he sees in idea before he is able to produce it in vegetable matter. So it is we may work with mind as he works with the vegetable kingdom. We may develop from the resources of our own higher nature, drawing down by the laws in which we live those higher powers that we desire to make available in the world, in which our great work is the spiritualising of matter and the making of matter the obedient servant and instrument of Spirit. So, if we choose, by hard work—and certainly by a good deal of what may be looked on as self-denial, save that nothing should be called by that name which leads us to the object which we will to achieve—we find it is possible to develop this intuition ahead of our race, and so to attain the knowledge of the eternal verities before that knowledge is reached by the average evolution, which only works slowly by the many workings and antagonisms in nature; whereas evolution can work more rapidly when the antagonisms are eliminated and the powers we desire to develop are given their full scope. And in this Science of Yoga, there are, as you know, two distinct paths that were very well explained by Dr. Van der Leeuw during our late Convention, the path of the mystic and the path of the occultist. They both seek the same goal and they both seek to bring human consciousness to the Real and the Eternal—two names really only for one great truth. The mystic finds it by plunging down into the depths of his own nature, putting aside everything that is passing, everything that is transient, everything that is temporary, using that phrase that Mr. Jinarājadāsa used a little time ago, the Sanskrit phrase, "Neti, neti—not this, not this," and so putting aside everything of the changing

mind—"not this, not this"—all the thoughts that flow or drift through the mind or are created by it—"not this, not this." Naught that changes is Eternal; naught that is transient is Real.

And so he who follows the mystic path puts aside all these changing things, and they become to him indifferent. He does not seek pleasure if it is not there. He does not reject it if it is there. He takes the things as they come and go, the contacts of matter impermanent, with that higher indifference which rejects naught and desires naught, to which nothing is alien. And so, putting aside the transitory, one thing after another, that which is in the cravings of the body, that which is in the satisfactions of the emotions, that which is in the thoughts of the mind, he goes down into the depths of his own nature and finds at its very centre the Life of God. A solitary path, for none may help him in it. A path often misunderstood, because as he treads it he seems strange and self-contradictory. And when he finds his goal, silence is all that he can show to the outer world. Philosophy can explain itself, metaphysic can explain itself, all that the mind constructs by the mind can be understood. But that Supreme which is the Reality, that Supreme which is the Eternal, from that it is written the intellect sinks back silent, and in that silence the great truth is found. And so mysticism can never be really taught to the end. There are many things that can be done, many ways of thinking that can be learned, but when the God without reveals Himself to the God within, in that Union silence is the natural, the inevitable atmosphere. And so it is written in one of the Hebrew Scriptures that the day shall come when no man shall say to his brother, "Know the Lord;" for all shall know Him from the least to the greatest—direct knowledge gained by each for himself.

The path of the occultist differs very much from that,

though it leads to the same goal. For men's temperaments are so different. The occultist seeks to learn and to amass knowledge, so that by gaining knowledge all the powers of nature may come within his grasp. So for the occultist it is possible that he may take the left-hand path rather than the right. His road branches off into those two ways; the path of the mystic is but one. For if there be in the occultist the desire to possess, if he does not purge himself of all desire for aught but service, if he does not from his very heart tear out the root of selfishness and seek only the larger hope, the God in all, then his path is a path of terrible danger, and many are the wrecks, says H. P. Blavatsky, that strew that path.

But if he has learned that greatest of all lessons, the longing to serve the larger life; if he only desires power that he may help the weak; righteousness that he may help the unrighteous; purity that he may help the impure; everything in order that he may give of himself to help his brother, then his path will climb the high mountain peak, and he will become one of the great helpers of the world. Along that path as well as along the mystic, feet have trodden of our own humanity. And in the New Civilisation as it grows and buds, there will be many mystics and many occultists in advance of their race. For wisdom is wanted to build the material fabric of that Civilisation as well as that union with the Divine which sheds the radiance of Divinity on the paths which are trodden by men. So we shall find in that New Civilisation the same great truths which are the heart of every religion, but we shall also find faith more and more replaced by knowledge, as I said. And so the evolution of the people shall be quickened and the darkness of ignorance shall pass more and more away from our world.

The condition of this growth is, I just said, Service. And the way to learn to love service, to learn to find

in it the one satisfaction that makes life worth living, is to strive to share with others the things that you already have. All that is best in you of knowledge, of art, of culture, of all these things which make a great Civilisation, religion will lead you to share them abundantly, until all have part of the gains that may have been made by the one. For what is that great verse of one who was a great occultist, the Apostle S. Paul, when he spoke of the poverty of the Christ; "though He were rich, yet for our sakes He became poor," and the reason is given: in order that "by His poverty, we might be made rich." Gradually we learn as we strive to live the Christ-life, which is the life of the Spirit striving upwards towards his liberation, we learn that all the really precious things we have are the things that we can share with our fellow-men if they lack them. For to grow into "the full stature of the Christ," to become a Saviour of the world, means that you keep nothing back for yourself, but share all you have of precious and of rare with those that are around you. It means that you are continually pouring out all that you possess, and that when you have poured it out, there flows from above, from the inexhaustible reservoir of God Himself, into your empty hands there pours down the power of the Godhead. And that is the aim of the occultist, that he may spread that power over the whole of the world, that in silence and in secret he may send out thoughts, thoughts that are powers, in order that the Civilisation in which he lives may be saved from its dangers and helped to all that is good. For even in this stage of our world that can be done to some extent. This ought not to be a wonderful thing to you, nor a thing incredible, when you see how the ordinary scientist has found out that these powers largely exist, and that he can utilise the subtler powers that have been discovered in order to spread human thought and human knowledge.

Moreover, owing to the cyclic law by which the Rays come into power in due succession, the Ray known as the seventh—during the dominance of which there is a more widely spread communication between the physical and the subtler worlds than has existed for ages—is now coming into power once again. Under this, by the use of due and appropriate ceremonial, whether in the various religions, or in such ceremonies as have come down from the Ancient Mysteries of Egypt and Chaldea, of which fragments are found in different Masonic Rites, the inhabitants of the subtler worlds can co-operate with human beings, and both gain by such co-operation increased power to aid and quicken evolution. In the religions, the Beings variously known as Angels, Devas, Shining Ones, are drawn to the ceremonies and take effective part in them, making them more potent for the helping of the human beings who perform them; and also taking from the human beings vibratory forces belonging to the physical world, that the human beings naturally use, and that the inhabitants of the subtler worlds cannot themselves generate. This co-operation between angels and human beings is thus profitable to both, and you may remember that it is specially mentioned in the *Bhagavad-Gita* as bringing great good to the inhabitants of the different worlds of denser and subtler matter.

Most religions in their rituals appeal to the Angels, or Devas, to join with the human worshippers, and it is obviously wrong to use invocations as a mere formality, not expecting that any response will be made by the Beings who are invoked. I have myself often observed how ready is the response, and how the atmosphere is changed when a real invocation with expectation of the due reply is made.

As more and more children are born into the world who are clairvoyant, the centre in the head which is developing and is the organ for clairvoyant vision will

come more and more into use. Later still, the Angels will be more ready to densify their subtle bodies, and become thus visible to ordinary sight. Then the "Fellowship of Angels and Men" will again become a generally recognised part of human life, and their radiant happiness and beauty will shed their benignant influence on our earth.

Even now you can do much by the deliberate use of your thought power. For what is your thought power? It is a power that in your own brain can be measured by a galvanometer. And as you have more strength, as you have more power under your control, your galvanometer needle swings more strongly. And what you call thought becomes a galvanic current in your brain—for all these forces are linked together. The worlds are not separated really from one another, but interpenetrate each other, and all the finer forms of matter interpenetrate the coarser, as you may send gas through water, or water through a porous solid substance. Why, then, think it strange or incredible that human thought, trained and developed to a knowledge of the powers which that thought can command, can be used to improve the civilisation of the world, to get rid of its evils, and to strengthen all that is good?

And when many join together in combination to use that thought power, when many congregating together work along the same lines in order that the power may be well directed, when the human will, which is our highest and divinest power, directs the way in which that current shall travel, do you wonder then that great changes may be made even by comparatively a few people using the power? That is the power used by the Inner Government of the world, subject to conditions. For all Nature's laws have to be obeyed. Knowledge is learned by obedience and not by disobedience to law. But if there were many of us, friends, who had the courage and the knowledge to

tread this difficult path of the occultist, then we might change the face of Europe and save it from the dangers that menace it to-day. I do not know that there is time enough to do it. I do not know that there are enough of us, so we must put our strength together to accomplish as much of the purpose as we can; but in the New Civilisation which is dawning, in the New Civilisation that is beginning to appear, although still veiled and incomplete, in that Civilisation the power of thought will be acknowledged and the outer Civilisation will be shaped by the thoughts of the noblest and the best. And in order that we may share in laying its foundations, in order that our knowledge may not remain without its fruit, in order that we may learn something of what the future may be, and use our dawning powers to hasten its coming, shall not some be found in this great land of Britain who will put, not only their country, but the world, before their individual gain and interest, some who will throw away the transient and work in the Eternal, and in that way become helpers, a benediction to the world? That is the thought I will leave with you as the outcome of our thinking of the new religion in the New Civilisation. The new religion will be a religion of sacrifice prompted by love and guided by knowledge. The new religion will have as one of its mottoes the phrase voiced by my friend William Stead and myself for a smaller effort, "The union of all who love in the service of all who suffer." That is one of the ideals that we shall strive to realise. For that we seek the powers by which we may help our race. And those who seek honestly shall find; those who give the fourfold knock, the knock of the Cross of Sacrifice on the closed door, to them that door will be opened; and by them the foundations of the New Civilisation will be laid.

LECTURE III

EDUCATION IN THE NEW CIVILISATION

FRIENDS :—

My subject, Education in the New Civilisation, is unfortunately rather a subject for a series of lectures than for a single one. For it is complicated; much knowledge has to be grasped if a scheme, a system, of education is to be developed which would lead to a higher and better and more brotherly civilisation than our own. I must do the best I can to start you thinking on the subject. And, after all, that perhaps is the best use of a lecture—not to dogmatise and impose the opinions of the speaker, but to stimulate the members of the audience to their own individual thinking. For it is thus really that knowledge spreads, and by thoughtful discussion much may be done to remedy the faults of the past and to open up better avenues of progress for the future.

When I speak of the New Civilisation, I have to remind you that in its fullness the Civilisation of the next sub-race, and later of the Mother-Race, will take long in evolving, and that during the time of the evolution of that new human type the present civilisation will go on. Unless it breaks to pieces by continuing on some of the lines on which it has started, that civili-

sation will continue, and I hope will evolve forms of Education that will enable it to rise higher than it has risen in the present, and to avoid terrible collapse, the catastrophe which has swept away the earlier civilisations of our race.

And I shall want to ask you to consider in dealing with Education what you conceive of as the " human being," the children who form the subjects—and very often I am afraid the victims—of the Education imposed upon them by their elders. If the elders will consider that every new generation brings some new gifts to the human race, if they realise that what is wanted is not merely that which they may have wished for in their earlier days, but that which will help the new generation to make progress, to develop all that it brings with it; then the present civilisation in a higher form would naturally continue while the younger sub-race and the new Mother-Race were developing, and many, many changes of the most vitally beneficial character might be evolved, not for the New Civilisation, but for a higher form of the civilisation that we have at present, the civilisation of what we call the fifth, the mind sub-race, of what used to be called the Aryan Race; I believe its name has been changed now, but I am going to stick to it, because it covers other great groups, this Aryan Mother-Race.

Now when we are considering what we mean when we talk of the human being, we have no full records, either religious or scientific in their nature, which tell us of those great continents on which it is said the human race was born and then developed, the continents, the first of which is below the Pacific, and the second of which is below the Atlantic Ocean. One remnant is said to have been brought from Atlantis by one who said that he had brought it to China from the City of the Golden Gate—the capital of Atlantis. *The Classic of Purity* it is called—a very small work. It

has been translated into English, and is of wonderful mystical beauty. There may be other remnants hidden perchance in China, if ever that mysterious country becomes open, willingly open—not by force—to the thought, the scientific thought, which may evolve out of the turmoil of the present.

There may possibly be hidden secrets of knowledge which that ancient race, sheltered from the great catastrophe that shattered its Continent, may have saved, may have developed, and may still have in its keeping for the helping of our knowledge of the world of the past. That, however, is only a matter of speculation, and the first definite idea that we have as to the stage of the human being in the great ladder of life comes to us from our own ancient Motherland in Central Asia among the Āryans. Some think—I do not know with what justification—that parts of those great *Upaniṣhads* brought down into India were brought from far-off climes and contained some of the knowledge of the past which has been lost. Anyhow, taking one of those, whatever its age may be, it tells us of the One. "Spirit" or "Life" are both confusing words because they connote their opposites, spirit and matter, life and form; whereas we are led back in this to the manifestation of a fragment of that which is pure Being, manifesting Itself in order to bring a universe into manifestation after Itself, showing Itself in three great ways, power, wisdom, activity. And in a much later commentary on that statement we may read that the first quality, pure existence, so to speak, was shown in the mineral kingdom; then, that the beginnings of feeling went on and produced the vegetable kingdom; then, that a still greater activity produced the animal; and finally that in man the three great modes of consciousness appeared that I mentioned—power manifesting as Will, wisdom as Realisation of the Supreme, creative activity as Intellect.

With these modes of consciousness limited in man, many a Civilisation has been constructed.

Ancient India evolved for itself by thinking and working a very wonderful system of Education, an Education which showed a knowledge of man's nature, showed how that nature could be trained and helped to develop, taking it that under the whole of the multiplicity of forms there lay the Unity of the Supreme Self. That Education remains to-day in history, but very little in actuality in India now. For it has been overlaid, crushed practically under the modern Education carried thither from the West. And it is only comparatively lately, by the efforts chiefly of Indians, that it has been brought to light—though I must pay a tribute on this matter to the Madras Government, because it has issued for many, many years now a definite history of uncovered memorials of every kind, of buried inscriptions unburied, of inscribed metal plates which had also become buried and been brought up from excavations which had been carried out. So that we have there a mine of information as to the past, which makes it easy for anyone who cares to take the trouble to reconstruct, not only the history of Education in India, but also the record of many unfortunate social and economic changes in modern times. The history is full of valuable information, since the country lived by those ancient institutions for thousands of years, and while they existed, it was never known poor, never known ignorant, and never known continuously miserable. The ancient system of Education lay at the bottom of all the enduring prosperity. I do not propose to go into its details, because it would take far too long. I dealt with it at some length in a lecture delivered to the University of Calcutta on "Indian Ideals," one of which was the Ideals in Education. It is interesting to note in passing that it is an Indian Scientist, Sir Jagadish Chandra Bose,

who has proved in the experimental way of the West the truth of the old religious teaching of the unity of life, proving—to the satisfaction, as you know, of the Royal Society that made him one of its Fellows—that life reacted similarly in the human being and in the sub-human kingdoms—in the animal and in the vegetable and in the mineral. I believe he has some hope —I do not know that it can ever be realised—that he will be able not only to descend into the sub-human, but also to ascend into the super-human, and prove the identity of super-human life in the subtler realms of matter. However that may be, we have quite enough to go upon in dealing with Education if we are to utilise the ancient science of the East and the modern science of the West. It is interesting that at one supreme point these two are entirely at one, and that is on the idea that it was evolution, stage after stage of the development of life, which led up to man reproducing the three great attributes of Spirit in Will, in Self-realisation, and in Intellect.

We may drop for a moment into the Middle Ages and find a Musalman Doctor striking again this note of evolution. And in a very curious way; for all through it he spoke of himself as "I" passing through the stages. For he wrote the striking words: "I died out of the mineral and became a vegetable. I died out of the vegetable and became an animal. I died out of the animal and became a man. When did I ever grow less by dying? I shall die out of the man and become an angel." With a wonderfully keen insight he pierced through the apparent ending of man at death. He did not take refuge, as it were, in revealed religion, but he declared that he had passed through these stages, and had become man, and that death would again presumably be the portal to a higher stage of life and not the ending of life, as for a brief time modern science was inclined to think. And when

we come to the many splendid discoveries of modern science through the last half of the last century, we find one very wonderful triumph of its thought. For a time, almost blinded by the splendour of the facts discovered, science was inclined to plunge into a material explanation for the unfolding of life. You may remember how Professor Tyndall—you won't remember the speech, I suppose, many of you, but you can read it and you must know it, anyhow, by tradition—declared to the British Association for the Advancement of Science that we must look to matter for the promise and potency of every form of life. And then you may remember that twenty years later Sir William Crookes exactly reversed, turned upside down, that statement, and declared that we must look to life as the force moulding and shaping matter—an idea that was far truer than that of his predecessor.

Now when we come to look at man as he has been evolved through many, many ages, then it is not unnatural that we should strive to understand how we can best add to the rapidity of his evolution by utilising that intelligent appreciation and application of natural law to the child that has been used so successfully in the vegetable and the animal kingdom. It is natural and right that we should study the human being, that we should realise how he is constituted, realise the great departments of this evolving life, or I had better say unfolding life, developing, in the form in which it occupies, instruments suited for its use. That was a very, very ancient idea. It was said that the embodied Spirit desired to see—and the eye; Spirit desired to hear—and the ear; desired to [illegible] Always the struggle [illegible] to shape its instruments [illegible] them, utilise them for the growth of the [illegible] for the development, so it runs, of those who [illegible] reproduce in miniature its own perfections.

And looking at man in this way as a microcosm—the word macrocosm has often been used of the world, the universe around him—we have to distinguish in him the different parts of his being, those that every one of us recognises, whether we think or do not think that those are reflections, or reproductions rather, of the same modes of consciousness existing on a higher level that do not enter at present into our "waking consciousness" as we call it. And so we find ourselves with this waking consciousness of ours, which is the consciousness with which we have to deal in Education, although if we think there is a higher of which it is the reproduction, that will largely influence our main method of Education. For instead of thinking of Education as merely an attempt to develop certain qualities that the child brings with him, we shall think of the child as an embodiment of the Divine Spirit, that Spirit reproducing itself in miniature as what we call his mind or thinking faculty, his emotions and passions that we may call feelings, classing them together, closely related as they are, and these embodied in a physical body through which they show themselves in the outer world. On the unfolding of these, the training of these, the helping of these to grow into their higher forms, on that will depend our success in Education. Therefore we need this knowledge of the very essence of the human being, the Spirit, and his manifestations through the mind, through the feelings, and through the activities of the body.

So we have as the field of our Education, if I may so call it, first, physical Education; then emotional Education, emotions being primarily the passions of the body, the cravings of the body played on by the mind when the man remembers and anticipates; the mind can guide and direct those emotions and use them to produce happiness and not, as do the passions of which they are refinements, to spread unhappiness as the

later result of momentary physical pleasure. For this we need mental education, including the drawing out of the faculties of the mind and their training to their utmost capacity.

For we want to make our child a citizen, a good citizen, first in the family, then in the larger community of town or city or country, then in the whole land as a Nation. But shall this extending circle of citizenship be bounded by the boundaries of the land in which he lives? Or shall he overleap those boundaries? Shall he utilise the teachings of the home, of the community, of the Nation, widen out his circle to other Nations, love them and serve them and help them wherever opportunity occurs; become a citizen of the world as well as a citizen of a country, have an international duty, an international usefulness as well as that which is limited by the boundaries of his own native land? For if Education should be all that it might be, if our knowledge of human nature makes it possible gradually to eliminate the results of ignorance, gradually to eliminate all the side which causes trouble to others and replace that by service and comradeship with others, if that be a possible result of Education, then it is an ideal indeed, as all ideals should be, but also an ideal to be reduced to practice. For an ideal is a fixed idea that influences conduct; otherwise it is not worthy of the name.

Looking at it in this wider way, we see this great horizon opening up before us, beginning in the centre of the home, carried on over the world in which we live. Looking at it in that way, we begin to see that what we are doing with the child is not simply drawing out any germs of qualities that he may bring with him which may be useful in the life for which he is preparing, but that Education is very much more than that. Some of you may have read Mr. Jinarājadāsa's smaller books in which one word very constantly occurs, and it

may have struck some of you as a curious word to use in the connotation in which we find it, and that is the word "Release." He speaks constantly not of bringing out a quality, as it were, which the child has in germ, but of releasing a power that the child has, a power divine in its nature. So that Education becomes a removal of obstructions in the way of that power coming forth, rather than a nourishing of certain germinal qualities which the child has—opinions differ whence he has obtained them, but which he undoubtedly possesses. No one now denies that a child is born with a character. Some used to say it came by heredity, and some now say it does not come that way. But anyhow, it is there. One of my Musalman writer friends, I remember—for I have read the little I can which has been translated out of Arabic and dog Latin of the Middle Ages—says that a child comes into the world with his character tied round his neck, and that is his destiny. A true connection, because more important than anything else in the destiny of the child is the character which he brings with him into the world. But if, instead of taking that idea, which is a partial truth and is valuable in its way, we take the other idea of the child as the embodiment of Divinity, of the Divine Life, then we see him as having in the activity of the creative intellect the higher life of which the mind is a reproduction as known to us through the brain; if we take the higher spiritual quality of Self-realisation, Intuition as it is sometimes called, then we realise that it is related to the instincts and the emotions of the human being, and in that supreme power of the Will, that divinest part of man on which his happiness depends in the future even more than it depends on the purification of the emotions, you have the possibility of the only freedom which is real, and by bringing the Will of the individual into accord with the

Universal Will, the Divine Will. That Will ever works to greater and greater good, and we begin to realise that freedom lies in service, service to the Divine Will and accord with the Divine Will. For human good, however slowly our ignorance may make it come, lies in that will of man coming into accord with the Divine Will. That is the secret of man's constant progress, despite all temporary faults, all partial setbacks.

One great lesson that we learn from the scientific view of evolution is that all progress is made by the efforts of the inner life, the struggle of that life to express itself, the continual urge of that life to make its vehicles of resistant matter bow to it and serve its purpose in the outer world. For the purified will and work of man is the hand of the Divine, as it were, in our world. And through man God works out His beneficent purpose, and makes the children of men the redeemers of the world. That is the work of Education, to liberate, to release, the Divine within what we call man's higher nature, and also to train its reproduction in the lower by those outer methods of teaching which will conduce best to the evolution of the Divine Man, the unfolding of the Hidden God within.

And as we begin to think over this, we also begin to realise that the Civilisation that we desire must be the aim of our Education, that its very aim and purpose must be to make a Civilisation which is worthy of humanity. And I submit to you two or three facts in the civilisation round us which show fairly clearly that as Education has produced the people of to-day, the citizens of to-day, there must be something sadly wrong with the Education given to the young, where these faults show themselves in the adults, the stains on civilisation, that it is our duty to try to remove.

Now one of those I will put to you a little brutally for the moment. It sounds very harsh, but I want to

mention to you one or two facts in passing which I think will show you why I say that this Education of ours must be defective in some vital matters. In the adults of to-day there is so much indifference to suffering among their fellow-men. Now I know that that sounds harsh, and your minds will go to the many efforts that are made to lessen suffering, to the many attempts of good men and women to sacrifice themselves in order to help others. All those are good and true and beautiful. But if there were not in the majority a rooted indifference to the conditions of their fellows, you could not have lasting in the life of to-day certain things that we are capable of remedying and that are not remedied, because we have not yet eradicated from our nature a certain pleasure in danger to others provided we are not involved in it ourselves. And this is true not only here; it is true everywhere to an extent that is shocking when you begin to consider it. You note how continually people talk about something that gives them a thrill; but if you enquire into the kind of thrills that they seek, you mostly find that they involve some danger to human life or human limb. Take a thing like the racing at Brooklands, and you will see exactly what I mean; the tearing round and round a circle made for the purpose and the eager people who watch it, knowing that at any moment those drivers may be flung broken from their cars, not for any good purpose, but to get a certain speed more than somebody else has reached. If it were an effort to save a human life, if it were an effort to carry assistance to some scene of disaster, then men are justified in risking their own lives, but not that they may get a money prize, not that they may bring crowds to watch them. These are things that demoralise a people. But there is a much worse side to this. I am very fond of reading the *Morning Post*. I do not say I agree with it, but I get a good deal of useful information from it,

I have two extracts here—I do not think they are meant to be read together—but they come out of the same number, June 14th, so that I am not to blame if I do cut them out of the paper and read them together. They will show you exactly what I mean by indifference to human suffering. Now the first of these—this is a short one—is the last stage in the Devonshire House scheme. There is another block wanted, and that is going to consist of 105 luxurious flats, and £350,000 are going to be spent on those "luxury flats," as they are called. That is the heading of it. It drew my attention—"£350,000 Luxury Flats. The last stage in the Devonshire House Scheme." Between two and three millions altogether are being spent on that scheme. Now this same instructive journal gives an account of a survey carried out in the City of Westminster, and that survey has revealed not anything that people do not know generally about the condition of large numbers of the poor, but some specific cases. They give a fair number of them here, and they point out that a great many of the people live in damp basements. They give one case of a widow with three daughters and a son, i.e. five people living in two rooms, the back room terribly damp, and the tenant remarked, "We have to live like animals." That was a mistake of the tenant. Valuable animals are kept very carefully from disease that would grow out of keeping them in damp basements. Their lives are too valuable to their owners, more valuable than the human lives that are spoken of here. That was in Rutland Street. In Aldernay Street there are damp basements with the boards laid on mud without concrete foundations, and sewer rats so numerous that within twenty-four hours of the laying of a new board it was eaten through. That is enough, I think, to show you the contrast between the luxury flats that are being built on the Devonshire House site and

the way in which people live in the City of Westminster, not so very far removed from the Devonshire House site.

Friends, I submit that if these things exist and are published in a newspaper read by many, many thousands of people without one word of protest—a doctor said it was not worse than other places, in fact it was better than some places—that is not much satisfaction to the people who have to die there. I ask you whether, if we all really cared about it as we should care about it, if our brother or our mother were living in the City of Westminster in one of these horrible places, would we allow without protest the waste of huge sums on luxury flats for a handful of people, while we know that thousands of people in London are living in basements and attics and in sculleries, and carrying on their lives suffering almost from birth to death? I have been down to some places in the East End. I have talked to some of the people there, and I remember vividly a splendidly made woman who had come from the country. I looked at her children, little wizened, starved creatures. If we all remember these things and work against them, they could not last. And I plead for an Education that shall teach the younger generation whose hearts are warm, whose enthusiasm is easily stirred, whose emotions are quick and can be guided by high ideals of social service, and to the reform of scandalous abuses, I plead for such Education in order that this misery may be removed, because their hearts will be ready to work for the redemption of the people when they have been educated to understand their duties as citizens of a land like this. And if you say it would cost a great deal of money, granted. There is money enough wasted, not only in luxury flats; why not scrap your battleships, and use the money you waste on them on the Education of the children on humane and noble lines?

Now let us glance a little more in detail at how we should begin this work of better Education. I have mentioned those departments of our waking consciousness, because those are indubitable facts. They are before you all the time. Now how are you to release the Divine Spirit if you believe in God, or to train the emotions of sympathy and comradeship and compassion which we find in all young people? Now the first thing you want to get rid of entirely is fear. Think of the child for a moment, how helpless it is, a baby born into the world. The mite of a creature surrounded by great giants, I imagine, to its little eyes, absolutely at their mercy. Then consider how often, as that baby grows, especially among the thoughtless and the careless, he is frightened, threatened if people are at all inclined to roughness. And even thoroughly good people as we know them are thoughtless as to the way they speak to a little child. Has it ever struck you that a child should never hear a harsh word addressed to itself, and never have a moment's fear of anything from which he can be guarded? For the great quality we all of us want, the great quality we all of us admire, the quality we must have if a Civilisation is to be reformed, is that quality of courage to which fear is the great obstacle. If a child is to grow up as he should grow up, brave and full of courage, full of enthusiasm for the right, then it must never know what it is to fear. I know that sometimes it is said children have faults. Yes! So have we. But we are not afraid, as the child is made afraid. A child has no defence—especially at home. Its parents sometimes lose their tempers, although the child apparently must never lose his. For if he loses his he is "very naughty." Now we want an Education that shall be absolutely devoid of anything that creates fear, because half the faults, as they call them, of the children are the result of fear.

I can remember a silly little story of my own very young childhood when my brother and I had made a little festival for my dolls and his animals, I think, and there had been a large sugar almond put as a kind of *pièce de résistance* for the occasion. I was accused of stealing this. Well, I had not, as a matter of fact, and I said I had not. Somehow or other, whether it was that a servant took it and wanted to shield herself I do not know, but it had disappeared and I was whipped for the lie. That is to say, I was frightened into saying what was not the truth. I was made to tell a lie. I had spoken the truth when I said I did not touch the thing. I do not know to this day what became of it. I remember my terror, and I was finally forced to say I had taken it. Whether it was a good thing to think that I was a thief and a liar I do not know. I am sure that my own dear mother never thought I was either of them, but she thought a child ought to be taught to tell the truth. The way to tell the truth is to make a child fearless, not to frighten it. For a child has many difficulties in what we call telling the truth. In the first place he has a very vivid imagination, and that is a thing that I would ask all of you who are elders to remember. A child's body does not know the world into which it has come. It is interested and amused watching things. It fancies a great many things that you and I would say were not there. Whether they are there or not may be a question as to whether we ourselves are, or are not, what is called clairvoyant. I know of one case of a child that had as playmate another child who was not visible to physical sight, and he used to come out into the garden and play with this invisible child and talk to it and talk of it. Having sensible people around, nobody contradicted the child, nobody said anything against it. That is one way in which children are often misjudged, and that is why I mention it. Do not take it for

granted when they say to you what seems to be untrue, do not take it for granted that it is untrue for them. Then remember that a child with a quick imagination will see things—not with the physical eye truly; but how shall a child distinguish in the use of words in a language it is re-learning or learning perhaps for the first time. The knowledge of a presence there, to a child, is seeing. There are many things of that sort in which young children suffer a great deal and often lose a faculty that might be developed, because they are afraid of being accused of telling a lie. Then again, if they are sensitive, if they are afraid of a harsh word or of ridicule, it is we who are driving them into falsehood. I am thinking of the value of courage, which is natural to the free Spirit, remembering a very fine verse of an old Hindu Scripture, that God is fearless. Let us realise that we should give the child the completest liberty consistent with his safety from injury. As we watch him try to understand him; see what is his bent, as we call it; see what is his special faculty and what are his peculiar powers, what he does not possess that we might like him gradually to develop. Then let us try to give him the Education which will cause these powers he shows to develop to their fullest. Remember that this is the right of the child. For it is the weak who have rights, and the strong have duties—a fact that is too often forgotten.

Now we hear a great deal about the rights of men. I do not complain of that particularly, but I would rather hear of the rights of the child and of the animal; for they cannot defend themselves. We have the duty of protection. And in the New Civilisation and in, I hope, the improvement of this Civilisation, children will be taught, and they will learn easily, to love all who are around them, human beings, animals, playmates, all the things that feel. And they will never know what it is to find an animal they have loved and

petted, as sometimes happen in country districts, appear on the dinner table, to the horror and suffering of the children. Very few children like meat naturally. Why should we not get rid of the meat diet altogether when we know all the suffering that it causes? Many of your diseases come from the poisons caused by the terror of the creature led to the slaughter-house at the smell of blood. It poisons its blood which then you have in its flesh on your tables. As has been well said, you often "eat pain." Then you wonder why disease is spreading. You wonder at the spread of cancer, a very painful disease. And you torture other animals to find out cures, instead of stopping the torture of the animals that you eat for food. In the New Civilisation we shall not have meat. We shall do without it, and we shall be very much more comfortable and very much healthier and very much happier for its absence. Of course, you all know that such absence is one of the conditions made in some countries where they have Yoga as a part of religion. People who do not trouble about the suffering of creatures in order that they may have the perverted pleasure of meat-eating do not realise at all the effect of that meat-eating on themselves. One of the things I was most glad to hear of in America was that the Chicago purveyors of meat are complaining of the spread of vegetarianism and the decrease of the orders that they receive—that great element of compassion is increasing, that duty to the sub-human kingdoms, that these younger relatives of ours of the animal kingdom are not ours to use as we like, but ours only that we may help in their evolution. People talk about the cruelty of nature. But what is the cruelty of nature to the wild animal compared with the cruelty of man to the domesticated animal? The wild animal knows very little of fear if it is really wild, and is not so savage as some of you might think. The villagers of India drive away the

tiger with sticks from their villages if he intrudes into them out of the forest; but then again they do not go into the forest to shoot the tiger for amusement in the place that is its natural habitat. We have to alter our feeling altogether in our relation to those who are in our power, whether they are human children or whether they belong to the sub-human kingdoms. Animals are ours for service—our service to them—because that helps on their evolution. They pay us back with love, many of them, and we can make their service to us helpful and not so harmful as it often is to-day. This great human virtue of compassion, of pity, of sympathy, if we use it habitually and cherish it in the children, they will show it as they grow up and leave a nobler and a better civilisation. So part of our Education must be this sense of comradeship with everything that lives around us.

Then there is the training of their own bodies. Remember that that training cannot be done well unless the child during the first seven years of life has thoroughly healthy surroundings, plenty of nourishing food, and open spaces for air and sunlight. Gradually, I believe, people are beginning to understand that those first seven years of life can never be made good later, if advantage is not taken of them during those years. The physical health of the body through life is injured by neglect of thoroughly healthy surroundings through those seven years, and special work has to be done with the body during those years. Scientists will tell you the child goes through the stage of the savage. His senses are very, very keen. Think, then, of these senses and their Education. For those are the years when their education is of vital importance. But, above all, take care of the physical health. Look at our children here, so many of them playing in the streets. It is not only the danger of being run over; it is the constant sapping danger of

want of fresh air and sunlight which undermines their health for the whole of their lives. That is a point which I would ask all of you to consider. There are so many squares in London—you know it well—where the people living in the houses round them have each a key, but very seldom trouble to go into the square. Why not throw them all open to the children, children of the poor, and let these empty squares, instead of alleys and slums, be their playgrounds. One of the good signs that you may see is that efforts are being made to provide playgrounds in every City where children may go and have the possibility of healthy and useful exercises, and have the training of the senses in those first seven years.

I expect you know the story of Houdini, the great conjurer, how he trained the senses of his son, because he wanted him to be a conjurer in his turn. As he walked through Regent Street with this little bit of a boy when he passed a window he said to the boy, "Just look in as we walk past." A little time after, when he asked him what there was in the window, at first the child did not know. But that training of the child's eyes grew to such an extent that after a time he could name almost every object as he walked slowly past the window, and could remember them all, imprinting them on the brain rapidly as he went by.

Now, as you know, that training is part of the Montessori System, not in that particular form, but the training of the eye, the training of the ear, the training of touch to distinguish different fabrics. All these sense qualities are very vivid in the child and very easily trained.

During the next stage of seven years you have to think of the emotions. Do not wait till the emotions become tumultuous; do not wait until these emotions surging through the boy and girl are not understood by them, not knowing what they are or whence they come. That is not the time to begin the training

of the emotions. It is by holding up great ideals, especially examples of human excellence, stirring the minds of the young boy, of the young girl from seven to fourteen, stirring them with the ideals of the really great men of the world—I do not mean great soldiers. I do not mean great generals and admirals, or people of that kind. I mean great benefactors of the human race, great masters of painting, of sculpture, of all things that are beautiful, great men who serve their race, who sacrifice themselves for men and not men for themselves—the difference between the hero and the coward. Hold up these before the boys and girls, and they will try to work them into their own lives.

Training in some manual occupation should be part of Education from the beginning. For manual labour should accompany the training in literature, in mathematics, in all the subjects of ordinary Education. In addition to these, there should be manual training for all, for that teaches accuracy and dexterity, teaches grace of body as well as strength of body. And the body must be thus trained through youth as well as in the younger days and on into manhood, so that our men and women may be more beautiful with each generation, as they will be if this side of their education is attended to. Then we shall begin to realise what a human body can do. We shall understand how much can be developed. And in the training of the body do not forget the training of what they call team games, for this trains character as well as the body—the following of a leader whom you have chosen for his skill, the willingness to take an insignificant part in the game, if it makes it the best for the group with which you are playing, the willingness to be insignificant so long as the group wins—those are steps on the way of Service. Those are gradual trainings of the character in good temper, in comradeship, in willingness

to work, not for any absolutely personal end. In that way you train the growing youths and make them better citizens of the Commonwealth of which they will form a part. Then when you come to fourteen or onwards, then is your chief time for the training of the mind. The reason is a physical one, that until about that age the brain has not developed the network of cells necessary for the purely intellectual studies, the studies in which logic, reasoning, are involved, and in which an argument is carried on from one point to another. You know how very often boys at school are taught Euclid. I am afraid that sometimes, not following the proof, they learn the letters marking lines and angles so that they can recite the problem perfectly, but if you alter the letters they are lost. It is no good to blame them. They cannot reason things out. We have to suit our Education to the child, not only to his own special qualities but to those common qualities of the growth of the brain which must be thought of, if our Education is to be thoroughly wholesome and not harmful in its object.

And make your education as varied as you can. Never force the child. I know sometimes the child will be what you call idle. He does not want to be idle, but he does not want the particular job you are giving him to do for the moment. If you would try to follow the child's likes and dislikes more, as teachers are beginning to do, you would find that very often the thing the child wants to do is the thing for which he has special capacity and power, and the thing which you want him to do is a thing for which he has very little faculty, very little power of enjoyment in the learning. A child wants to know, and that is what every teacher should remember. But he does not always want to know what the teacher wants to teach him. That is a very different thing. A wise teacher, if he finds the pupil inattentive and careless will put

that particular subject aside for the time and find out what the child really wants. You will not spoil the child by that attention to the nature that he has, and you can teach him to make an effort to learn at a time when he will be willing to make it. If you have considered him, he will consider you in turn. He will respond to your thoughtfulness, to your kindness, to your readiness to meet him half-way. Very often if a child is tiresome at his work and you turn him out into the playground for half an hour, he will come back refreshed and bright and ready to go on again; whereas if you put him in the corner or try to punish him foolishly, you will only make him sulky and ill and full of dislike. The great triumph of a school is where the pupils are all glad to go back to it after the holidays, because the children look forward to the varied employments and pleasures there—what they are doing, what they are accomplishing, what they are creating.

But now if this is to be done there is one point I must put to you, and it is this: neither student nor teacher should ever have anxiety during the educational period as to his means of living, as to any cost he may undergo. Now in the old days in India it was the duty of the learned man to teach, and those great Universities of India were wonderfully beautiful. You can read the stories of travellers, and especially of Chinese travellers, who went into India sometimes to find learning at those very places. It was the rule there that the State, or the Government, or the wealthy people, gave the money for Education, but they did not exercise any control over the money. That is they did not control the Education. That was the duty of the teachers. I wonder if it would be possible to get that into the modern head. The Education of the child is vital for the Nation. An ignorant child grows up a danger to the State. The better educated your children are, the fewer will find their way to the gaol,

or the workhouse, or the asylum. The old rule was that what the teacher wanted should be supplied to him, so that he need not be anxious about himself or his family, and thus not as good a teacher as he otherwise would be. I have read the lists of the clothes supplied and so on at the various Universities of India. The same thing was true of the Governments of that day. They thought if a man's duty was to teach, he would be the best judge as to how he should teach. And while they gave money from the King's Treasury, the King had no share in the control of Education. Apply that to your modern schools and your modern Govérnments, and you will get rid of your Government Inspectors; moreover, you would have better teachers where teaching is honoured and respected as it was in the old days in India. I read how in a great convocation at a University the King of the State came in and no one moved. But when the Head of the University came in, "the Venerable of Venerables," everybody got up, King and students and public and everybody else, and waited until he took his seat. Social rank was given to the learned and not to the wealthy or to the rulers. There again you will find a possible answer to the question of expense. In those old days they used to divide the rewards to people according to the kind of work they did. The teacher must have food and clothing, but he did not want magnificence or splendour of any kind. His learning was his wealth, and his reward was honour, fame. Another reward was wealth, and the third power. The teacher did not have wealth heaped upon him, but a sufficiency only, since his reward was the honour in which he was held. And the merchant—he was the man to have wealth, and his duty was to supply the wants of those whose work for the Nation did not bring them wealth. And the ruler might be splendid for his reward was power, but he was not regarded as one

who was to have everything else heaped upon him. You give one man—say a Prime Minister—a big income and power and honour, heaping on one all the different rewards that can be given. But the harder the work a man does, the more disagreeable it is, the more it is of the nature of drudgery, the longer it is and the smaller are the wages. That is just the upside down way of distributing the various rewards that a civilisation should give to its workers. Every man ought to have a vocation in the State. Vocational Education is coming back to you. It is what they called Caste Education in India long ago, for the caste was the vocation for which the man's powers fitted him. Gradually we must realise that every man has a duty to the Nation into which he is born, that no man has a right to monopolise all rewards, but that every man should have his share; that which is needful for a happy and healthy life. We must have a civilisation where everyone is educated for the first twenty-one years of life, as you educate very often the people who are least useful to you in your civilisation; we must give every man respect who does his duties as a good citizen, whether he be a labourer or whatever he be. Remember also that if he does hard drudgery, then he ought to be better paid than the man who does easier or pleasanter work, because that drudgery increases for him the difficulty of the human life. We should give short hours and higher wages to the man who does the unpleasant drudgery, so that he may have leisure, and means to fill that leisure with the cultivation of the more human qualities which are denied him by the civilisation of to-day.

Do you know that in America, where everyone is now educated, where it is very difficult to get a servant at all, that the house has machinery by which all the difficult parts and the drudgery parts of household work are done. The mistress of the house, even though she may be well off, does not have a dozen servants as

she might have here. She does the work, because the machinery does it for her. She puts the materials for the dinner together, arranges them in the machine, turns a little dial to the hour at which she wants the dinner to be ready, and goes out about her other work, or her amusements or duties, and she finds the dinner cooked and ready waiting for her at the hour to which she has pointed on the dial; so that household work there is not a burden. I have been living in America just recently, that is how I know about these particular details. I want them applied all through, because I have often said, in speaking of machinery, that it is meant to give leisure to workers and not to make them into machines. What you are doing now with your machinery is to make a man the slave of the machine instead of the machine being the slave of the man, to give him leisure and time for cultivating his more human qualities.

I look for a civilisation in the days to come, even before the next great human type has thoroughly developed, in which we shall have a civilisation of comradeship, a civilisation in which we can easily meet together socially, in which all will be educated, will be trained in good manners and courtesy and the graces of human life. That is the civilisation that you can make if you will. There is time enough for you to do it while the other human stage is developing. If you have the will to do it, the heart to do it, the courage to do it, then you may make an Education which will change the face of your Civilisation and all will have a life really worth the living, noble in its aims, beautiful in its surroundings, great in its achievements, the life of which man is capable, for which man is intended.

Let us try to make that life possible by an Education that will create a civilisation worthy of the human race.

LECTURE IV

ECONOMICS OF THE NEW CIVILISATION

FRIENDS:—

To-night I am going, as you know, to discuss a very thorny subject on which much difference of opinion is found. And so I repeat, in order to avoid any possible misunderstanding, that in discussing any subject on which difference of opinion exists I am not committing in any way the Theosophical Society of which I am the President, because within our Society all opinions are free. Everyone is expected to form his own opinions, and I have no authority of any kind, as well as no desire, to impose my own particular opinions on any member of the Society. The only thing that we are all bound to is Universal Brotherhood. We try to be a nucleus of such Brotherhood, to spread it abroad in the world; but the Society does not lay down any special way in which that Brotherhood is to be brought about. People of very different opinions as to the methods of realising Brotherhood are equal members of the Society, with their own methods of carrying out its objects. Therefore I say specially to-day, where I shall put forward very definite opinions with regard to Economics in the New Civilisa-

tion, that I am speaking entirely for myself, stating the way in which I interpret the practice of Brotherhood, and not imposing upon any member of the Society the particular form along which I am working to realise that Brotherhood.

Now there is a very general consensus of opinion, I think, that the present condition of things is intolerable; indeed, in very many ways it would be ludicrous if it were not intolerable. And in order not to multiply a number of opinions, I have selected two that I have come across during the last week of very widely separated classes of opinion both of which agree on the intolerable conditions that now exist. Both of them agree in the absolute necessity of removing these conditions, and of the responsibility and the duty that lies upon us. Now one of these is in this week's *Spectator*, which, I understand, is now regarded as a Conservative journal, and therefore naturally not in favour of very violent changes. It publishes some of those particulars to which I alluded last week of the condition of certain parts of Westminster which, it says, exists within a stone's-throw of Buckingham Palace. After describing these conditions, the frightful conditions in which many of the people of the slums of Westminster live, it goes on to say:

> To publish such things, knowing that they are true and that there is no quick and simple remedy, makes us burn with shame. Why do we tolerate such breeding-grounds for disease and degeneracy? Why, at whatever cost, do we not strike a blow in the teeth of the wrong?

And then it goes on to argue, and to argue quite truly:

> It is we who are alive and who glory in the many-sided life of to-day on whom the responsibility falls. We have chosen our path. We cannot go back on the industrial road of Western civilisation. Indeed, we would not do so.

A true conception of Christianity and consequent co-operation between classes will, we believe, yield a richer harvest in human happiness than any of the crack-brained extremist doctrines of Communism. But slums such as these in the Victoria Ward of Westminster are a menace to all that we hold most dear and a proof of how incomplete is the expression of our faith. Let us remember also that the Victoria Ward is only one of fifty cankers in London, and that there are a score of other cities equally diseased in these islands.

There is the view, then, from a highly respectable Conservative newspaper.

The other quotation that I selected comes as a result of a Missionary Conference, and it is headed: "The Demand of World Renaissance: The Missionary Response." It begins by the statement:

A drastic transformation of attitude by the Christian forces of the West was called for throughout the sixteenth Annual Conference of the Missionary Societies of Great Britain and Ireland, which broke up on Saturday morning after three and a half days at the Hayes, Swanwick.

Then after giving a number of reasons why action had to be taken, it points out that a definite effort must be made in order that the present conditions may be changed:

Our impotence arises from a lack of joyful confident expectation of the Kingdom and all that it implies.

Then it goes on to say that that is what the Missionary Societies should be doing:

Only when we get that can we irradiate our home field as well as the field of Islam, Hinduism, and the rest with the light of Christ.

Now look at these two confessions for a moment; they each represent the present conditions of things as intolerable. In fact one speaker described how a group

of desperate Christians, worried to death by the impotence of the Church in face of a changing world, came together and gradually are finding light. That is a position I think in which most of us will agree if we try to think it over, and to realise what are the conditions which cause this intolerable state.

Right economics must be the foundation of any real and serious dealing with the great problem of poverty as it exists in modern countries. You cannot persuade people for the most part to listen very patiently to other sorts of reforms, if they are suffering from pressing physical needs, if their bodies are ill-nourished, if they dwell in slums, if the general conditions of health, even of reasonable health, are unattainable by them in their daily lives. Disquisitions on Economics even can hardly interest them, unless these Economics point to methods of remedy, remedy for which those who speak of it are prepared to work and to bring about in a reasonable time. It ought almost to be enough to provoke economic changes to consider what I spoke of as the real absurdities which exist in our midst. I mean such things as you see every day at the present time, of vast numbers of unemployed, potential producers of the articles necessary for life, yet unemployed, and those articles which they themselves might produce cannot be produced by them because of the social conditions under which they are living. They cannot get employment; and without employment they are obliged to spend their time in idleness; and to depend on some form of charity which injures their self-respect, at the same time as they cannot avoid it if they desire to keep their bodies alive.

Now the fact of that co-existence of people who could produce what they want and yet who remain in forced idleness—surely that is a thing which ought to be remediable by human thought applied to the conditions,

the social conditions, and the economic conditions which prevail in this country. And those are not the only points that have been urged over and over and over again against the economic system under which we live. It has been pointed out, as you know, that the more successful labour is in the quantity of the articles it produces, the more is it faced with the state of over-production, and is thrown either upon the streets or shorter hours, so that the over-produced articles may find a market whereby they can be distributed among those who can pay for them.

Now surely there is something inherently absurd in the fact that warehouses are bursting with goods which labour has produced and needs, while that very labour suffers from its over-production of goods, although it is under-supplied with the very articles that it has so lavishly produced? These are things that leap from the very surface to our eyes, and yet they go on year after year, yet very little real effort is made to get rid of them by dealing with the fundamental causes, economic causes, that produce them, allowing those causes to continue to produce unemployment and so to make labour, as it were, very largely its own executioner for a time. There are so many things of that sort that have been dinned into the ears of the public year after year, year after year, and yet the system goes on existing amongst us, either as if we had no brains to remedy it, or no hearts to sympathise with the sufferings that it produces.

Now, as I have said to you, in America they have been able to abolish poverty for the native-born American. I have to make that limitation because you still have poverty in the slums of a few cities in which the immigrants multiply. We can find working in America a number of causes which point to the way by which poverty might be abolished in other

countries as well as in America. And in dealing with this let us remember that the Americans gradually, though very rapidly, have abolished poverty among themselves. We can find there has been going on for some years what has quite rightly been called by a well-known Professor of Harvard University, "An Industrial Revolution in the United States." That Industrial Revolution has not been a violent one. It has not been a Revolution brought about by legislative enactment. It has been brought about by the deliberate thought of the people themselves, by starting certain means of action deliberately adopted, some on the part of the manual working community, others on the part of the employing community, which have changed the conditions of labour in certain very effective ways.

It is not necessary for me to dwell long on these because they are very obvious when they are mentioned; but I mention them in order that you may see what can be done in a country even without legislation in order to give into the hands of the workers the mastery over their own labour, making machines as they should be, the servants of men, not men the servants of machines, the producers of comfort for the workers by utilising certain definite means; some of these, as I say, have been done by the workers themselves, others where the employers have shown a remarkable public spirit. These I mention because they show what can be done, even without legislation, if the people understand the causes of poverty, and themselves take action in order to put an end to them.

Now one of those means which I read very carefully in this book, speaking of the Industrial Revolution in the United States, by Professor Carver of Harvard University, dwelt upon certain conditions brought about by the workers themselves through their Trade Unions. I was struck with that, because it was one

of the things that had been suggested, but suggested vainly, by my old friend and comrade Charles Bradlaugh, when he was advising especially the Northumberland and Durham miners—who were men of very strong independence of character and very well versed in the politics of the time—when he was advising them to use the accumulated funds of their unions, not in strikes but in purchasing businesses and carrying them on co-operatively under their own control. I presume that in that, as in so much else, he was somewhat before his time, for the idea was not effectively carried out. One or two attempts at co-operative production were made. They unfortunately failed, largely owing, I am sorry to say, to the jealousy of the workers themselves of their own leaders, the lack of trust and confidence in men who, by superior ability, had shown themselves capable of conducting business effectively, but who raised jealousy rather than gratitude, unfortunately, in those early days of co-operative production. (Co-operative distribution had been very largely carried out with success.)

Now in the United States that idea has been very well realised. The Trade Unions have bought up businesses, and knowing that the banks established by capitalists would not finance a working-class business that was growing, they took the very sensible step of creating their own labour Trade Union Banks. Those banks consisted of members of the Trade Union. They did not appeal to the public at all. They were made, created, by the Trade Union that had purchased the business. They stored in their own banks any money that they saved, and so financed the growing business, and have carried on several such businesses in the States which are thoroughly successful. Along that line there has been this co-operative industry making certain Trade Unionists masters of their own labour, and

profiting by its results by dividing the profits along co-operative lines.

I also found that there was a rather strange phenomenon there—the way in which certain great employers began and are now continuing to bring in those they employ as partners in their own business. It is the habit over there, and I suppose elsewhere, to give at certain times a bonus to labour in recognition of the share it has had in producing the result which goes so largely to the employers. Lately, some firms have been beginning not to give a money bonus but to give to their employees dividend-bearing shares in the business in which the men are employed; thus they have made them shareholders in the business. And as these shareholders multiply, they will gradually become the majority in the Company; and even before that is done they have the right to vote at the regular shareholders' meetings and thus have a share in the control of the business in which they are producing wealth.

Another thing that has been done there, and that is specially the action of very generous individuals, is that the Capitalist is putting a limit on his own accumulations. I presume men have found that they cannot use more than a certain amount of money, cannot wear more than a certain amount of clothes, or eat more than a certain amount of food. They find that they have more wealth than they really can use for the increase of their own happiness. They get, in fact, a satiety of wealth. The result of that has been that they have voluntarily, in some marked cases—keeping what will give them a respectable competency as they consider it, for the rest of their lives—handed over the rest of the business and its accumulated capital to be worked by the employees, under the guidance of the cleverest men there, who have been accustomed to management under the control of the real employers.

And so the business goes on producing its profits in the hands of the workers who make that wealth. These are the main lines of work by which great changes have been brought about in the United States. As I say, they have practically abolished poverty for the Americans. I am obliged to put in those words because the immigrant population (which they have now very carefully limited) is a certain menace if it should be allowed to grow too large; so now only a certain percentage of people of every country can enter the country each year. And these still live in the conditions of poverty in the places where they congregate, although, I presume, they gradually become assimilated with the American people, generally by inter-marriage, and so on.

Now, looking at these, we can see a number of forces at work which, while they are voluntarily set agoing, do ameliorate to an extraordinary extent the poverty that we find in the older countries. I do not think that those are changes that are likely to do very much over here, except, perhaps, the first one of the buying up of a business and working it co-operatively by the Trade Union that buys it. But there is one other point that we may just notice in passing that has made an enormous difference to the working classes of America, and that is, that not only do they have an exceedingly good education, but also there is no feeling of class there, which puts a man into a particular social position because of the employment in which he gains his livelihood. That is a feeling which has entirely disappeared, so far as I have seen, and I have mixed with many kinds and types of people there; there is that social feeling of self-respect and of respect for others which makes the ordinary workman in America feel himself to be a citizen in a free country. He is neither aggressive in asserting that fact, nor apparently conscious of any other possibility. He talks with you

as your equal, as over here a person, in whatever class he may happen to be, would speak with those whom he considers to be his social equals.

You have, then, peculiar conditions in America which you could not easily reproduce in an old country like this. But I do desire to suggest to you in this country that a profound economic change is absolutely necessary, that unless that change is brought about, the civilisation cannot last, nor ought it to last with the canker of poverty eating out the very life of great masses of our people. There is, of course, one enormous advantage that the American worker has in addition to his good education and to the absence of class feeling; and that is that there has been a certain new experiment in that country, the Trusts that were first formed in America many years ago. Now in the book called the *Fabian Essays*, it fell to my lot to write on that particular form of American production, and I pointed out then that the Trust was a most useful institution, because it made it so very easy for bodies elected by the people to take over the production of the necessaries of life, and to administer them by able managers such as the Trusts secured, but for the benefit of the country and not for the benefit of a comparatively small number, a combination of capitalists. Now that most interesting experiment, which would inevitably have led to Socialism if it had been allowed to go on, was put an end to by President Harding. He had a wonderful admiration for what he called the small individual worker. It did not strike him that that small man all by himself was not a particularly strong or free member of Society. The President thought it developed individuality, and so under his impetus Trusts, as they first existed, were made illegal. But a thing that is necessary practically because of its great advantages cannot be legislated out

of existence. And while the inter-State Trust was rendered impossible by law, the Trust could exist as a "company" within the limits of any particular State. Hence the Trusts have come back again to a very considerable extent, and they are finding ingenious ways of getting round the law, as you generally can if you use a certain ingenuity in your proceedings. Trusts in the separate States are somehow or other getting linked up together, so that the inter-State thing is somewhat of a reality although not legal and although not openly acknowledged. It is impossible to stop an economic movement that enables goods that are necessary to be produced at a comparatively low cost, because by combination the great expenses of competitive advertising are done away with, and by the large number of people that can be organised to work together a very small profit out of each individual workman amounts to an enormous fortune, where those huge numbers of profits pass into very few pockets.

And so you have in America, of course, some enormous Companies, especially for oil and other matters that have an assured sale, and in that way organisation has taken a place in American Economics which is not recognised at present apparently here. They do not speak in America of three constituents of wealth production, raw material, labour, and capital, the accumulated savings of labour. They add a fourth and that fourth is a very important one in its practical utility. They add "management." In that it is that very largely you have the extraordinary success of American labour, and the result, this abolition of poverty among the manual labour class of native-born Americans. The organisation of large numbers of people, the managing of production in the most economic ways, the keen brain ability brought to bear upon pro-

duction so as to minimise the cost, to make larger profits, those are really the economic doctrines which lie at the root of this change in American production which has raised the manual labour class entirely out of the miseries of poverty. And that is a point which is certainly worthy of consideration. Sometimes it is applied, of course, for the gain of a particular person, as in the very remarkable case of Mr. Henry Ford. But then in his particular case you have the exceptional junction of a marvellous brain for business and a warm human heart which sympathises with the lot of those who are engaged in the production of wealth. That is a rare combination, but it is a fact that we are bound to admit in his case, if we know anything of Henry Ford's life. One outward sign of it you can see in the way in which he has gradually been reducing the hours of labour without reducing wages, so that now he has only a five-day week instead of a six-day week (he hopes to reduce that, he says, still further), so that without the men losing anything of the high wages that he pays—for he pays high wages while demanding great efficiency from his workers—he now gives them two days of leisure in every seven, so that they are able to utilise the results of their education, so that they can add to that education the culture which is one of the most precious results of education, the application of the knowledge gained to the understanding of human nature, and that wide sympathy with great varieties of human kind that ought to be the mark of culture everywhere and is the mark in some. So you find him not only looking for high efficiency from the healthy men, but also providing for the cripple, for the blind, forms of work which they can do despite their physical disability, and in that way enabling them to earn their own living—not separated off in asylums, or anything that looks in the least charitable, but having their

places in the great working organisation which has made his name famous over the world.

Further, we find one mark of general prosperity, which might rather surprise a good many of the people employed in factories over here, if it were reproduced here; and that is that you find the ordinary workers going to their places of work in some form of motor vehicle. There is a great deal of buying and selling of motor-cars there, and the motor-car gradually becomes second-hand and third-hand, and it is sold at a very cheap price. So that if you are going through a place in which labour is concentrated for work, you have to be careful to choose your time if you want to get on fairly quickly, because when the workers come out at four o'clock the whole road is blocked with their motor-cars and motor-lorries and other motor vehicles carrying them back comfortably and quickly to the homes away from the place of labour, and therefore the healthier and the more enjoyable also.

As I mentioned before, so many of the very pretty towns in America have roads of single houses, with their lawns going down to the side-walks, and borders full of flowers; they like to make the place look pretty for everybody who passes. Then when you ask what kind of people live there, you are told: "Oh! just the ordinary workers." They have these homes and spend the leisure gained by the use of machinery to shorten the hours of labour according to their own tastes.

Now all that has been done in America, but it is not along that line I should suggest that our efforts should be concentrated here. It is far easier in a country like America, a new country with an enormous amount of available land and comparatively a very small population—they are about 120 millions now, but that is as nothing in comparison with the immense extent of the United States. In a country like this, small and

densely populated, far more rapid means are necessary, and are within the reach of the workers if they will use the power of the vote that they possess to bring about reasonable legislation to make economic changes in the country.

For there lies the real and right way of changing the economic conditions here to those of the New Civilisation. I am not able to deny that a people who are oppressed and suffering—oppressed by those stronger than themselves—I am not able to deny their right to revolt against that oppression when they find it intolerable. But I do say that in a country like this, where practically you have now, if you choose to use it, universal suffrage; where if you are convinced that a thing is right you are able to bring it about by peaceful and legislative means; if you have at present a Trade Union Bill which destroys the work of generations of the working classes; if you are threatened with a new Constitution which you are never to change—the most remarkable kind of Constitution that the world has yet seen—then these things are the fault of those who do not care to change their own condition, who are led astray by thoughtlessness, prejudice, or other reasons, instead of looking at the condition of the whole of the people to-day, and bringing about those radical changes in Economics which are known by the general name of Socialism.

Now in using that word, I am using it because while I said that in the Theosophical Society opinions are absolutely free, there is one thing which has come out of the utilisation of that science of Yoga that I spoke of last year in this hall, by which it is possible to quicken individual evolution and to forecast the future more accurately than one could do only by the watching of tendencies in the present. According to that, with the new sub-race which is now being so rapidly born,

especially in California in Western America, with that new sub-race, looking on the world from the standpoint of its Inner Government, we shall have Socialism definitely growing. In what I have called the "Happy Valley" (because I hope it is going to be a Happy Valley before very long), we shall have a kind of miniature of the New Civilisation which will have economic Socialism, practical Brotherhood, as its basis, added to that hierarchical form of Government which places the Government in the hands of the wise.

I presume that what you now call Democracy is searching for a way by which to find out its best men, and so far not entirely satisfactorily, if you will permit me to say so. But it must be searching for them. It must want to have its wisest men, its men of highest character, its best men, in a word, at the head of public affairs, whether in the community or the town, or over the whole of the country, and in the Great Commonwealth of Nations. Clearly you cannot have a Government which will be able to understand how to govern, unless the members of the Government are wise, and unless to that wisdom of the head they add the desire of the heart to bring about happy conditions for the masses of ordinary humanity. Now wisdom has been sometimes defined as knowledge united to love, and I think, on the whole, that is a very good definition of it. For you may have very wide knowledge, and at the same time that knowledge may be selfishly used and be more mischievous to the community than beneficial to it; but if to knowledge you add love, then you have the wisdom which is the only true authority, knowledge which understands and love which applies that understanding equally to all. Such people, to the extent to which we can find them, should have the power to rule, given by the willing allegiance of their fellows. You can often notice, if you are dealing with a crowd,

that the instinct of the crowd is on the whole right, that the crowd is more moved by unselfish heroism than by a selfish advantage grasped at. It is the man who sacrifices himself who becomes the hero of the crowd; the miner who goes down at the risk of his life to save his fellow-workers after an explosion; the fireman who plunges into the burning house to save a human life—those are the men whose sacrifices arouse enthusiasm, because the heart of man is good, and they recognise and love heroic goodness wherever they see it. It is those who combine wisdom with heroism who are the natural leaders of a free people. It is those whom any sensible Democracy must be trying to find, though very often misled in its search. None the less it must find them, otherwise it cannot continue to exist.

With that, of course, there comes a great responsibility to understand the causes of poverty, and then the duty to abolish them. Obviously the way must be by the method of skilfully organised co-operation, carried out to its natural and inevitable ending in Socialism. In America—where they are dreadfully afraid of the word Socialism because they have only known it in the form of bombs and rioting on the part of the unfortunate immigrants who have come out of great tyrannies in Europe and bring bitter hatred of Governments with them—they object very much to the word. So I used the word "Co-operation" when I preached Socialism there, for Socialism is really National Co-operation. I should not have been allowed to preach "Socialism." I should have been deported if I had tried to teach it under that name. And as, after all, words are meant to express thoughts, and as every thought about "Socialism" is hopelessly wrong in America at present, it would have been misleading to use a word that would have been entirely misunderstood. So I used the word "Co-operation," or "well-

organised Co-operation," and under that taught what H.P.B. called the "Socialism of love," and I found it met with very great approval. Sometimes I pointed out that England has done much more in the way of socialising the supply of many things, especially by municipalities, than America had, and very much to her own advantage. I told them of the municipalities which had taken up the supply of many necessaries and conveniences of life, and where the profits of the supply went to the reduction of taxation, thus returning to the people. I saw one day in a newspaper here that it said: "If that is Socialism, let us have a great deal more of it." Well, that is one of the things that Socialism is, the supply of the necessaries of life to the profit of the people who want them, the organisation of Industry by those elected by the Community chosen for business ability, and who are put in control of business undertakings. The one thing you want to avoid, if you are going to start a business, is being in a hurry and being too enthusiastic and optimistic.

Now, in our experiment which we are going to carry on in California, we have already begun road-making and soon will line the roads with trees. In our Happy Valley, which is to be a miniature of the New Civilisation, we have begun by saying that every industry carried out there must be co-operative—no individualistic enterprises in which people sell for their own personal advantage, but co-operative bodies to supply the various necessaries of life, and everything to be done in the co-operative way. That habit of working together, the training in what is sometimes called team work—the extension of the spirit which makes a good player in a match in schools and colleges, each thinking of the whole body and not of his own individual glory—that is the spirit that we want to spread in the whole of our Community.

Over here we want every voter, man and woman, to recognise that the desirable economic changes can be brought about by legislation, if the people really want them; and the task is to persuade the people that they do want them by showing them their efficacy in theory and in practice so far as we can.

So we need to establish in the country deliberately, in all municipal work, the duty of the municipality to act as the organised Community of the town by which it is elected. That is one of the ways in which Socialism in the towns has slowly and very inadequately, of course, spread in England. Then we want gradually that the great National undertakings shall be taken over by the people as a whole, so that as great wealth is made, it may come back to the people themselves. If you take a few cases of the opposite kind, you can see at once how effective such legislation might be.

Now I have not the exact figures of the water supply of London, but that, as you know, was created by a Company, and the shares have grown so enormously valuable with the growth of London—which the Company after all did nothing to promote—that people sell fragments of shares and sell them at a very high price. Now supposing that the water supply of London had been taken in hand by London instead of that private company being formed, there would have been one large source of wealth flowing into the huge town which has grown up. As the town grew and the need for water grew the wealth of the town would have increased, and instead of the water supply of London going to enrich people belonging to a company who have inherited shares from their ancestors, London taxes would be lessened by the price of the water supply, and so we should have coming back to the citizens, to a very large extent, that which they now pay in taxation. If this is recognised surely it should be possible to prevent the

formation of private companies for the supply of various necessaries of ordinary life. Why should private companies be allowed to supply your means of transport for the profit of a particular body of shareholders? Why should railroads, the necessary means of transport for great masses of the people, why should their profits go into the pockets of shareholders? The very moment you are in National danger, the very moment that the life of the Nation must be thought of before the profits of shareholders, you take over the railroads into the hands of the Government and run them. But it is said that they did not pay so well. No, because they were not managed economically, because you carried troops very often for nothing; none the less you utilised those railways under the stress of National needs in a socialistic way. But under Socialism we may hope that you will not have wars, as you have them at the present time. For you must remember that no war could take place in Europe to-day if the great capitalists refused to advance the loans which make the war possible. Wars are really made, or peace is made, by the power of the great financiers in Europe at the present time. It is they who decide whether a country shall go bankrupt or whether it shall succeed; they who decide whether they will finance a loan to such and such a Government in order that it may be able to make war on a neighbouring State. You think your Parliament decides. You think your citizens vote for it. Yes, but behind them is the power of money, without which no war can be made. It is a menace to Europe all the time, because war is a very money-making thing to a certain number of people, and therefore it is to their advantage to have a war, no matter how the Nation may suffer by the horror of it. Why should you not do what France has done through its Prime Minister with regard to America? Why should

you not make a Pact with America, that you will not enter into any war with her? Monsieur Briand is outlawing war between France and America. Why not between Great Britain and America? Why should there not be peace among all the Nations of Europe? For after all of what is composed the population of America? It is made up out of emigrants from European Nations who have gone over there, who have settled there, who living near each other have learned to know each other and by knowing each other have learned also to love each other. It is ignorance that makes race hatreds, and knowledge that does away with them. Why should we not have a United States of Europe as well as a United States of America? Why should not war be outlawed between European Nations? American States do not now fight with each other. People have grown into one Nation made out of all the different Nations of Europe. Why should we not teach here in our schools and practise in our manhood and womanhood that ideal of the United States of Europe, which would put an end to War from one end of this continent to another? For after all our interests are the same. The more we can spread common interests, the less danger will there be of War.

But even if you should establish Socialism here, if the land of England belonged to the people of England, if the great needs of the Nation in transport belonged to the Nation, if all these large concerns were nationalised, so that no one might be born into the English Nation who gains nothing from the land which is called his native land, why should we not still look forward to a time when the Nations will realise that their common good lies in peace and trading and abolish all the barriers that separate them so that the frontiers of a Nation may not need to be guarded? Do you realise that along three thousand miles of borderland between

Canada and the United States there is not a single gun to guard that borderland? Why should not the same thing be the case over here?

But there is one economic menace that you have to consider, which is not one of your own country or within it only, that great economic pressure of the coloured races on the land ruled by white races, the land taken away by the white from the coloured peoples. There is a menace that you must think of, and that you must gradually eliminate. For it is an ever-growing economic danger. The great economic pressure cannot be long resisted by any legislation that you can make. You may make your legislation, as children make sand castles by the sea. But the tide comes up in spite of the sand castle, and when it retreats again the smooth sand has reappeared. So with the great economic laws of human life. The economic pressure of the coloured races is becoming too great to be withstood. We speak of the chaos in China. But China is naturally a very peaceful Nation. Why is it that there is a hatred of the foreigner in China to-day? Because the foreigners have demanded the open door for themselves into China, and have denied it for the Chinese into their own countries. Because you have in China an enormous population of some four hundred millions of human beings, and because you have within reach of China Canada, as large as Europe, with only eight millions of people in it. The whites hold the vast ranges of Australia for the six millions of whites there, while Japan, which has one-twentieth the acreage of Australia, has nearly ten times its population. Those are the world economics that you have to consider, not only the economics of your own Nation, not only the economics of European Nations, but the world economics, the great coloured problem which is pressing more and more for a solution. The real hatred is not so much a

hatred of the white, but the economic pressure, the pressure of people who cannot live in the land where they were born, and who see great empty spaces calling out for cultivation and find those spaces barred from them by people who cannot utilise them. That phase of world economics you must consider. For it is there again an economic question; economics lie at the very root of the whole of our national welfare. What, then, shall be our hope in this? I say to you frankly my hope is in the young far more than the old. In the student population of every land there lies the hope of the world's brotherhood in the near future. You do not find among the students of the Nations the same antagonism, the same suspicion, the same hatreds that you find among the elders of those same people. Go to what country you will, go, perhaps, even above all, to our late enemy the great German people, and you will find that it is the youth of Germany that have no resentment, no hatred, no desire for revenge, that they want to raise their own land by what there is great in her, by her art, by her music, by her philosophy, by her science, and not by the miserable weapons of War. And it is the same in other lands as well. The movement in China is led by Chinese students. The movement in all great countries to-day is being led by the young of the countries. Why, your little children of Wales over in the West of Britain, in that little land, the school children, as you may have seen in 1922, sent out a message of good will to all the school children of the different countries of the world. America answered it and has made a Good Will Day, and Australia is answering it, and many States there are making a Good Will Day on the 18th of May. It is in these young people growing up desiring to be friends with the people of other Nations, in our boys and girls in the schools, in our young men and women in the Colleges and

Universities, there lies the hope of England as the hope of every other Nation. For it is they who shall bring about the better conditions, Brotherhood in practice, the welfare of the people. Those are they to whom I look to make the New Civilisation; those are they in whom National hatreds are not arising, but rather a love for other peoples as brothers.

Let us encourage the young, then, in their enthusiasm. Let us hold up the ideals that we have so shamefully failed to realise. In the coming generations there lies the hope of the future, and it is they who will make the New Civilisation a Civilisation of practical Brotherhood, of love to all the Nations of the earth.